E 30902

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND

AND

THE PRESENT CRISIS.

REPORT

OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF

THE GENERAL SYNOD,

HOLDEN AT DUBLIN.

MARCH 23, 1886.

Dublin:
HODGES, FIGGIS, AND CO., GRAFTON STREET.
LONDON: W. RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY.
1886.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

THE

CHURCH OF IRELAND

AND

THE PRESENT CRISIS.

REPORT

OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF

THE GENERAL SYNOD,

HOLDEN AT DUBLIN,

MARCH 23, 1886.

DUBLIN:
HODGES, FIGGIS, & CO., GRAFTON STREET.
LONDON: W. RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY.
1886.

342.415
CA7c

27 Jd 13 (6 in 9

INDEX.

PAGE

Archbishop of Dublin (Right Hon. and Most Rev. Lord Plunket, D.D.) 6

Bishop of Limerick (Right Rev. Charles Graves, D.D., ex-Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin) 12

Sir Frederick W. Heygate, Bart., M.A., D.L., ex-M.P. for the County of Londonderry 15

Bishop of Down (Right Rev. Robert Knox, D.D.) 20

Mr. Richard Bagwell, M.A., D.L. 22

Bishop of Derry (Right Rev. William Alexander, D.D.) ... 24

Lieutenant-Colonel John ffolliott, D.L. 30

Bishop of Cork (Right Rev. Robert S. Gregg, D.D.) 33

Bishop of Ossory (Right Rev. William Pakenham Walsh, D.D.) 36

Rev. George Salmon, D.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin, and Chancellor of St. Patrick's Cathedral 40

Dean of Clonfert (Very Rev. James Byrne, D.D., ex-Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin) 49

Right Hon. Robert R. Warren, LL.D., Judge of the Court of Probate 51

Mr. Thomas P. Cairnes, J.P., of the firm of William Cairnes and Son, Brewers, Drogheda, Deputy Governor of the Bank of Ireland, High Sheriff of the County of Louth 53

Archdeacon of Derry (Ven. Edward J. Hamilton, M.A.) ... 55

The Provost of Trinity College, Dublin (Rev. John Hewitt Jellett, D.D., ex-President of the Royal Irish Academy) ... 56

Mr. James Spaight, J.P., President of the Chamber of Commerce, Limerick, ex-M.P. for Limerick City 59

The Earl of Belmore, M.A., K.C.M.G., D.L. 59

Dr. William F. Darley, Q.C., County Court Judge 59

Bishop of Kilmore (Right Rev. Samuel Shone, D.D.) 60

Bishop of Killaloe (Right Rev. William B. Chester, D.D.) ... 60

Lond. sch. econ. & pol. sc. Ex

22 D '11

P 36693

NOTE—The GENERAL SYNOD is composed of the two Archbishops and ten Bishops of the Church, and of two hundred and eight Clerical and four hundred and sixteen Lay Members elected triennially by the several Dioceses of Ireland, and thus represents the Church in every District and Parish throughout the Kingdom.

Church of Ireland Special General Synod.

TUESDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1886.

SUMMONED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING

MANDATE.

IN pursuance of the authority vested in me by Sec. 16, Cap. I., of the Constitution of the Church of Ireland, I hereby convene a SPECIAL MEETING of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, to be held, God willing, on the 23rd day of this present month, in the Synod Hall, Christ Church Place, Dublin, at 12 o'clock noon; and I hereby request the attendance of all Members of the said Synod thereat.

The Meeting is summoned for the purpose of taking counsel as to the present Crisis in its relation to the welfare and responsibilities of the Church of Ireland, and of adopting Resolutions in reference thereto.

PLUNKET, DUBLIN.

March 8th, 1886.

The Synod having attended the celebration of the Holy Communion in Christ Church Cathedral, at 11 o'clock, assembled in the Synod Hall.

The chair was taken at 12 o'clock by his Grace the Right Hon. and Most Reverend LORD PLUNKET, ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

A portion of Holy Scripture and prayers were read by the Lord BISHOP OF KILLALOE.

A list of members was laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT nominated Dr. H. M. PILKINGTON, Q.C., as ASSESSOR.

It was proposed by the Very Rev. the Dean of Kilfenora, and seconded by the Ven. the Archdeacon of Clonfert, that the Rev. Canon Morgan W. Jellett, ll.d., and the Archdeacon of Armagh (the Ven. William E. Meade, d.d.) be re-elected Honorary Clerical Secretaries.

Passed unanimously by the clergy.

It was proposed by Dr. Pilkington, and seconded by Colonel ffolliott, that Mr. Henry Alexander Hamilton and Mr. Chaworth J. Ferguson, be re-elected Honorary Lay Secretaries.

Passed unanimously by the laity.

It was proposed by the Archdeacon of Armagh, seconded by Canon Morgan W. Jellett, and resolved—That if necessary the Synod shall sit to-day until 7 o'clock.

Letters of apology were read from several members of the Synod who were unable to be present.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

My brethren, clerical and lay, of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, owing to the sad bereavement sustained by our Church in the death of our late venerated Primate—a loss which we all keenly feel and deeply deplore—the responsibility has devolved upon me of summoning this Synod, and of presiding at this meeting. I am painfully conscious of the greatness of this responsibility; but at the same time, I do not think that any apology is called for on my part. I took this step in accordance with a power vested in me by the statutes of our Church, and I did so with the approval, and I may add, at the request, of my brethren of the Episcopate; and I hope I am not mistaken in believing that in so doing I have met a very general wish on the part, not only of the Synod, but of the Church at large. But while no apology, I hope, is needed on my part, yet it is right, if not for our own sake, at least for the sake of others, that we should explain the grounds upon which this Synod has been summoned; and in order that we may better do so, there is one question that ought, I think, in the first instance to be answered, namely—In what capacity is it that this Synod meets together for the consideration of the question now before us? Let me then say at the very outset that we do not meet here to-day as partisans. This Synod has never recognised party distinctions. This room in which we meet has never been made the arena for party warfare; and I hope the time will be long distant when our Synod will be degraded into the position of a machine for the carrying out of party tactics or party manœuvres. Even when smarting

under the blow which deprived us of our endowments, and separated us from the State—a blow which was due in a great degree to the Liberal Government of the day—it was, I think, to the credit of our Church that, having many adherents of that Government amongst us, we never allowed anything in the nature of personal invective or recrimination to be heard for one moment in this Hall. And may I hope that as we have done in the past we may do in the future? We have amongst us Tories and Whigs, Conservatives and Liberals. We have one or two Radicals, and perhaps one or two Home Rulers. Now, all I would ask of you is this—that if any one of these, to whatever political school of thought he may belong, rises up honestly to express his opinions this day, we shall listen to him with that respect which is due to anyone who comes forward fearlessly to state that which is the conviction of his heart. However, I have a further reason for noticing this particular characteristic of our Synod. The question that we have to deal with to-day—it is no use beating about the bush—is simply this—whether or not this Synod, this Synod of the Church of Ireland, is in favour of that policy which is known as Home Rule. They who are in favour of that policy often speak of those who take an opposite view as belonging all to one political party in the State. They are spoken of as Tories, as Orangemen, as Ulstermen. Now, I hope my friends in Ulster, and my friends the Tories and Orangemen, will pardon me if, for the sake of those who are without, I call attention to the fact that in this Synod we have a good many persons who do not come from Ulster, who are not Orangemen, and who are not Tories. It may not, perhaps, be generally known that a quarter of a million of members of the Church of Ireland belong to the three southern provinces. In my own diocese there are 100,000 Churchmen. Now, when we bear these facts in mind, and remember that we have in this Synod men holding various political opinions, following different callings, and representing manifold interests, great significance attaches to the resolutions that we may pass to-day; and the significance is all the greater because we, in this Synod, are elected to our present position by one of the widest and most comprehensive systems of representation to be found, I believe, in this world. Every male of full age in our Church, be he rich or poor, has a voice in the election of those who sit in this Synod, and, therefore, whatever resolutions we shall pass this day may be fairly considered as expressing the voice of the whole Church of Ireland. I have said so much because I think it is important at the commencement of our proceedings to bear in mind what really is the capacity in which we meet together, and what is the significance of the proceedings in which we are now engaged.

But another question now comes before us, and a very important one it is, namely—Have we, the members of this Synod, any right to deal with a question of politics? If we distinguish politics from party, I say unhesitatingly we have. We have done so over and over again. We have taken into our consideration Bills that were passing through Parliament in reference to our Divinity School, to Education, and other similar matters. We have appointed committees for the special purpose of exercising a constant vigilance with respect to legislation pending in the Imperial Parliament. We are, therefore, certainly fully justified in dealing with a question of politics. Of course, it is right for us in all such cases to exercise a wise discretion. There may be some questions of politics with which it would not be expedient for us to deal. And I confess, as regards this very question of Home Rule, I should have been very slow, under ordinary circumstances, to recommend our Church to rush hastily into the consideration of so difficult and tangled a problem. But an event has occurred which has put our duty upon this question in an unmistakable light. The Prime Minister of England, her Majesty's chief adviser, has written a letter to which a special significance must be attached. He has asked those bodies in Ireland that represent the various opinions—religious and political—of the community, to answer certain queries which that letter contains, and, as you may remember, he has specially demanded information from those who represent the minority in this land. Now, if we were at the present time to give no reply to these inquiries, I think we might very justly be subjected to reproach. We might be accused of acting unfairly to those who have to deliberate upon this question of Home Rule, and who, before coming to a decision on the matter, ought to have before them all the materials upon which to form a judgment. We might also be blamed for acting unfairly to the members of our Church who, if the time were to pass by during which such a declaration could be made without our making it, might ever after reproach us in the years to come. On these grounds I think we are fully justified in dealing with this question of politics as distinguished from a question of party.

And now, what is the attitude in which we should approach this question? It appears to me that the terms of the Mandate that has been issued guide us in this respect. We are invited to meet together for the purpose of taking counsel as to the present crisis, in relation to "the welfare and responsibilities of the Church of Ireland." The welfare and responsibilities of the Church of Ireland are, no doubt, nearly connected one with the other; but, at the same time, the words of our Mandate do indicate a

distinction. They instruct us, I believe, first, to consider how the present crisis—I may say plainly, how this question of Home Rule—affects our financial welfare; and, secondly, how far it affects our national responsibilities. As regards its effect on our financial welfare, I need not tell the members of this Synod how very much our finances would be imperilled by such a policy as that of Home Rule; but there will be others to-day who will deal with this aspect of the question, and who are more conversant with it than I am. I would rather speak now of those national responsibilities which, it seems to me, are of a higher order,—I speak of the responsibilities which, as members of the Church of Ireland, we owe to our native land. We often hear the Irish people spoken of as if they were a body of men altogether outside of our own circle. We are described at times as aliens, as the Church of the English garrison, or in some other terms which would certainly separate us from what are considered by some as being the people of this land. Now, I am sure I express the feelings of many here present when I say that I repel with indignation the idea that those who call themselves Nationalists ought to have a monopoly of patriotism in this land. I would especially urge this aspect of our responsibility upon all who claim for our Church the title of the Church of Ireland. I need not dwell at any length upon the grounds which justify us in making such a claim. While we would be sorry to unchurch any religious denomination in this country, we yet hold that because of the continuity of our ecclesiastical lineage, and because of the parity of our doctrine and discipline, we represent in this country, as no other denomination does, the ancient Church which was established in this land some fourteen centuries ago. There is no other religious community, we assert, which resembles that ancient Church in being at the same time Episcopal and free from the control of Rome. We have, therefore, a special duty resting on us as members of the Church of Ireland. But I am content to base our responsibility upon another ground, namely, that as Christians and Patriots we are bound to take a deep interest in the land of our birth. I think, then, we are all agreed that we are justified in approaching this question of Home Rule, although it be a question of politics, and that we are bound to approach it with a strong conviction of our responsibilities both as regards our Church and our country.

The question now follows—What claim has this policy of Home Rule upon our acceptance? This is a question which I know is very delicate ground to tread upon, and prudence whispers to me—"Hold your tongue, and don't commit yourself;" but conscience tells me that it would be wrong to seek a refuge under the shelter of cowardly silence. I, therefore, will approach

this question, and I will again ask what claims Home Rule has for our acceptance? Is it the case that those who ask for it are labouring at the present moment under some burden, or subjected to some grievance, which Home Rule would remove? I have carefully considered the statements put forward by those who advocate Home Rule, and I cannot for the life of me discover where the grievance is to be found. If any of our fellow-countrymen were living under the tyranny of penal laws, as they were, unfortunately, some years ago, if Catholic emancipation had not become a fact, if they were able even to complain of the ascendancy in this land of a State Church, or if they were able to persuade us that, owing to some fault in the limits of the franchise, or for some other reason, they have not a voice in the Imperial Parliament upon questions such as education or the land, sufficient to enable them to obtain their just and reasonable rights,—if, I say, they could bring forward arguments in favour of Home Rule founded upon the fact of any such existing grievance, I confess I would look at the matter in an entirely different light. It is no use trying to trample out a real grievance. But if there be no grievance, then we must trace these demands for Home Rule to one of two causes,—either it is a question merely of sentiment, or it is a question which is put forward because of some ulterior aims. If this were merely a question of sentiment, merely a desire on the part of Irishmen to have a Parliament of their own, not from any desire for something further beyond, but simply from a strong feeling of nationality, I really think I would be a Home Ruler myself. If those who desire to sit in that Parliament were all men having no ulterior aim, if they were all, in this respect, like my honest friend Professor Galbraith, I should not object to Home Rule as I do. I would go further and say, that if they were all men of the same type as our present Lord Mayor, I have some doubts whether I should be insuperably opposed to such a policy.

But is it not plain to everyone who is not blind to what is taking place at the present moment, and who is not deaf to what is being said, that there are ulterior aims on the part of those, in this country and in America, who exercise a chief influence among the advocates of this policy? This is, of course, a question on which it would not be becoming for me to dwell at any length. I should be sorry to quote in this Synod from the speeches and writings of those who demand Home Rule. To do so would, to a certain extent, lower the dignity of our present meeting. But I do not suppose that those who have thus spoken, and those who have thus written, would have one whit more respect for us if we said they had no ulterior aims. Undoubtedly, behind the claim for Home Rule—and we should be fools if we did not

believe it—there lurks the demand for entire Separation, and for a very advanced form of Socialism. With what is passing before our eyes—the state of social disorder existing in this land as the result of ceaseless agitation, how can we doubt the tendency of this movement? And if it be said that all is being done by Home Rulers that can be done to check these gross exhibitions of intimidation and violence, I would reply that I know of no stronger argument whereby to warn us against the expediency of Home Rule than to tell us that those who are leaders in it have no power to lay the spectre they have raised. And I would in all earnestness appeal to those who may be fascinated by the idea of Home Rule, and ask them are they prepared for what will follow. If the time should come when, Home Rule having been granted, this country should be in a state of bankruptcy, and if our Parliament should, in the first place, turn for relief to the endowments of Trinity College, might it not go on, as has been done in other lands, to seize upon the endowments of conventual institutions as well?

But it may be asked—Are you prepared to meet the alternative which will present itself if Home Rule be refused? This is a question which we must all face. If we are to look at this matter from a statesmanlike point of view, we must not look merely at the dangers which will follow on Home Rule, but we must also look at the dangers that might follow from its rejection. Are we, then, prepared for the floodgates of resentful disappointment that will, it is said, be opened in the event of the aspirations of the people being thwarted in this respect? In reply I would say that if this movement were based on a real grievance, I should not be prepared to face any such alternative. But believing that there is no such grievance, we must only do what is right, and trust in Him who has hitherto helped us. We know not how many things may arise to change the present aspect of affairs. It certainly would be a discreditable thing to the Constitution under which we live if it were impossible, by fair and just legislation, to repress crime, and at the same time, to concede the claims of justice. I will not believe that such a thing is impossible. But if the outlook presented by this alternative were darker than it really is, I would ask this question—Is it right that honest, Christian, patriotic men should yield to terrorism? Is it right that we should cower before the threats of those who commit acts which we believe in our hearts to be wrong? I believe that in so doing we should be bringing about the humiliation not merely of our own country, but of the great Empire to which we belong.

There is one other difficulty, I confess, which has weighed much more with me, and it is this. I have received letters

from many thoughtful men, who have appealed to me thus—"You are acting madly in trying to obtain such a pronouncement from the Church of Ireland. You are anxious that the people of Ireland should not be alienated from your Church. You desire that they should be gathered within its fold, and yet you are doing that which is most likely to exasperate them." I confess that this appeal, at first sight, has staggered me. But here again I have come to the conclusion that we must do what is right, and leave the issue in God's hands. And I have faith to believe that the time will come when our fellow-countrymen here in Ireland will learn to know who have been their true friends.

I will now sum up briefly what I have ventured to submit to this great assembly. I have, I think, explained the capacity in which we are gathered together this day—as those who are not tied to any political party, who do not belong to any particular class, but who represent the feelings of 600,000 members of the Church of Ireland. I have shown that we have a right and a duty to deal with this question, not merely as it affects the interests of our Church, but also as it affects the interests of our country; and I have ventured, with all diffidence, but honestly, to express to you what my own convictions are with reference to Home Rule. I now leave the further discussion of the question to abler and better hands. I will only just make one request, namely—that in our proceedings this day, while we quit ourselves like men, and express our convictions with no uncertain sound, we shall remember that Charity is the most excellent of gifts. Do not let us speak as if we regarded our fellow-countrymen as our enemies. They are our brethren. We should meet them not as a phalanx of contending foes, but as brethren who have been led by false guides to the brink of a precipice; and we should urge them to pause before they plunge into the abyss. Let us conduct our proceedings thus, and look up for help from above, remembering the injunction of which the Preamble to our Constitution reminds us, namely—that it is the duty of Irish Churchmen to further "quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people." And, if ever there was a time when this was the duty of our Church, it is now—in this crisis in the history of our native land!

The Lord Bishop of Limerick.—My Lord, I rise to move the first resolution:—

"That we, the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church of Ireland, assembled in this General Synod from all parts of Ireland, and representing more than six hundred thousand of the Irish people, consider it a duty at

the present crisis to affirm our constant allegiance to the Throne, and our unswerving attachment to the legislative Union now subsisting between Great Britain and Ireland. And we make this declaration not as adherents of a party, nor on behalf of a class, but as a body of Irishmen holding various political opinions, following different callings, representing many separate interests, and sharing, at the same time, a common desire for the honour and welfare of our native land."

I should fail to interpret the feelings of the members of the Synod if I did not seize the first possible opportunity of tendering their respectful and cordial thanks to your Grace for issuing the Mandate by which it has been convened, and for opening its proceedings, as you have done, with words of wise counsel and suggestion. I have, indeed, received no formal authority thus to express the feelings of the Synod; but, from every indication that has reached me, I gather a full assurance that in doing so I carry with me the sympathy and approval of every member of this assembly. In proposing this resolution for the acceptance of so numerous and important an assembly, and on an occasion so momentous as the present, I might well feel distrust of my power to discharge the office intrusted to me; but I confide in the indulgence of my hearers, who will find in the substance of the resolution itself what will make up for any defect in my advocacy. At a most serious crisis in the history of our country, all its great interests have been called upon to give an authoritative reply to questions of the gravest national moment. Amongst these interests it cannot be denied that the Church of Ireland is one of wide and important influence. When such an appeal is made, and when other bodies are giving their replies, it is impossible for the Church of Ireland to hold back in silence. Having deep feelings and convictions in regard to matters which, she believes, concern the vital welfare of all belonging to her, she must not shrink from giving utterance to those feelings and convictions; and if she speaks, it is, I think, plain that she ought to speak in the most solemn way, through this great body, which is the whole Church of Ireland in representation, representing as it does every diocese, every parish, every clergyman, and every layman of our communion; and these representatives have authority to speak and act on behalf of 600,000 persons—thousands which ought to be not only numbered, but estimated with a regard to their importance in the social scale. They stand in line, moreover, with about an equal number of Protestants of other denominations, agreeing with them in character and general sentiments. Altogether the Protestants of Ireland, though they may be only about one-fourth of the whole population, include amongst them the great majority of those who form the first rank in education, property, and professional eminence.

We are met to-day to declare, amongst other things, our loyalty to the Throne. I am aware that loyalty has been derided as an obsolete notion by those who are satisfied to think that we are all drifting towards Republicanism. But I can answer for it that the sentiment is very far from dying out. To say nothing of a chivalrous feeling of devotion for a Queen who is an admirable type of womanhood, a pattern of domestic virtue, there are plenty of men, both young and old, who would readily prove their loyalty by any sacrifice of fortune, limb, or life, that was called for in defence of her honour or her dignity—a Sovereign carefully trained in the principles of Constitutional procedure, sympathising with her subjects in troubles of which her own domestic griefs have taught her the terrible keenness—a mother who has brought up her children to walk in paths marked out by wisdom and benevolence, and to take an active part in all works calculated to promote learning, art, and charity. We owe to such a Sovereign an incalculable debt of affection and gratitude.

In dealing with the questions which come before us to-day, it will be found impossible to avoid touching upon topics, social and political, which are inextricably connected with the interests of our Church and religion; and, in the resolutions which will be presented to us, we shall be brought face to face with practical questions of a most serious kind. But I trust we shall be able to discuss them without being tempted to use language or arguments prompted by party spirit. There are in this Hall men holding different opinions respecting law, education, commerce, trade, agriculture, foreign affairs, but all agreeing to desire the continuance of the legislative Union. *We wish to have our laws made by and administered under the control of the Imperial Parliament.* That Parliament is not infallible. There is no individual here present who will not say that it has made mistakes in legislation with respect to many matters of the utmost importance. But, fallible as it may be, we are content to live under it rather than trust to such a Parliament as would be elected by Irish constituencies. The Imperial Parliament has at all events shown good intentions. It has represented, on the whole, the moral, benevolent, and patriotic aspirations of the best and wisest men of their time. And how much have they accomplished within the last sixty years to promote the real interests of the mass of the people, amending the laws so that crime has diminished and the social condition of the masses has been greatly improved. I need not remind you of what the Empire, of which Ireland is an integral part, has grown to under this system of government—of its immense extent, its wealth, its power, above all, the influence which it is able to exercise, and to a great extent does exercise, in diffusing throughout the world the human-

ising influences of civilization and religion. God grant that its glorious work may not be hindered by dismemberment or paralysis. The cords which bind the most distant colonies to England are being drawn more closely every year. This is not the time to try experiments of separation between the central parts of our mighty Empire. Its constitution has not been fabricated by politicians. It has grown up into its stately greatness, *occulto velut arbor ævo*. Our Prayer-book, in its services, shows the view which our Church takes of the functions and responsibilities of the Imperial Parliament as it now exists. It directs us to pray during their session "that God would be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations to the advancement of His glory, the good of His Church, the safety, honour, and welfare of our Sovereign and her dominions; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavours upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations." And let me remind you that the laws of the land framed by the Parliament are designed to enforce the Commandments of the Second Table, of which a great American, commenting upon the vicissitudes of political opinion and action, said that, at all events, "they would not budge." Our Prayer-book, explaining our duty towards our neighbour, tells us, among other things, that we are bound "to honour and obey the Queen, and all that are put in authority under her; . . . to hurt nobody by word nor deed; to be true and just in all our dealings; to bear no malice nor hatred in our hearts; . . . to keep our tongues from evil-speaking, lying, and slandering; . . . not to covet nor desire other men's goods, but to learn and labour truly to get our own living, and to do our duty in that state of life unto which it pleases God to call us." I need scarcely ask the questions, whether we can reasonably expect that a Parliament in Dublin will act in the spirit of the prayer to which I have referred, or whether the type of citizen with which we are becoming familiarised in this country is better than that which has been placed before us in our Catechism.

Sir Frederick William Heygate, Bart.—May it please your Grace, I have the honour to second this resolution. I come from a diocese which is exempt, to a great extent, from the evils and horrors of which we have frequently read. Still it has suffered in a large degree in the misfortunes of the country. We in the North have no desire to separate ourselves from the rest of Ireland. On the contrary, we feel that we have one Church, one faith, and our only desire is to identify ourselves with the whole Church of Ireland. I am sure you will bear with me in

any want of capacity I may display in the consideration of this subject. We are face to face with a crisis of the most momentous nature, and upon the solution of that crisis depends, in my opinion, not only the prosperity, but the happiness, of every member of the Church of Ireland, and, far beyond that, of every inhabitant of this country. Reference has been made to the Church of Ireland as being devoted and loyal to the Crown. I think there can be no doubt about that, and we may take it for granted. With regard to your Grace's observations as to the political aspect of the question, I may say, for my own part, that, coming from a part of the North of Ireland of which your Grace seems a little afraid, there is no feeling of exasperation, or anything more than the natural determination that every sensible man must feel to resist this great alteration of Home Rule, as it is called, or, as I prefer to call it, Repeal of the Union. As to Home Rule, it bears many interpretations. I heard in the House of Commons Mr. Butt's explanation, or rather attempted explanation, of Home Rule; but I may say he never succeeded in explaining what he meant. Far more is expected than Home Rule,—the repeal of the legislative Union of these countries, which is fraught with great consequences both to England and Ireland. I could not fail to be struck by what occurred in 1869, in the debates that took place, and in which I took part, when first the proposal was made to disestablish and disendow the Church of Ireland. We were told that it was a small matter, that the Union was perfectly secure and inviolate, that the question between the Church and State was a very small part of it, that they might safely disestablish and disendow the Church of Ireland, and that the State would get on very well, and the Church be none the worse. There were those who doubted the wisdom of this course. I am not going to argue the question whether it was right or wrong; but I wish to read one or two extracts from the speeches of Lord Beaconsfield on that occasion. Lord Beaconsfield spoke with a spirit of prophecy. It was the third reading of the Bill, the question was settled, and it only remained to accept the settlement in the best spirit of hope for the future. Mr. Disraeli, as he was then, speaking of Papal supremacy, said: "I do not blame the Papacy for fulfilling that which, with their convictions, must be their highest duty. One's ordinary knowledge of human nature convinces us of this—that if men are abler than others, if they have the advantage of discipline and organization when all others are undisciplined and disordered, when everything is in confusion, when everyone is discontented, when you have Captain Rock amongst the peasantry, and when you have the Protestants of Ireland feeling, as they will feel, betrayed and deserted, they will

take advantage of such a state of things in order to advance the opinions which they conscientiously believe are the right ones, and avail themselves in such circumstances of the discipline and order which they command." And then he went on to say: "And, again, will the Protestants of Ireland submit to the establishment of Papal ascendancy without a struggle? It may occur probably when the Union between the two countries, which is to be partially dissolved to-night, may be completely destroyed, for it is very possible that after a period of great disquietude, doubt, and passion, events may occur which may complete that severance of the Union which to-night we are commencing. What I fear is that it may lead to civil war. It is natural and probable that the Papal power in Ireland will attempt to attain ascendancy and predominance. I say it is natural, and, what is more, it ought to do it, and it will do it. Is it natural that the Protestants of Ireland should submit without a struggle to such a state of things? You know they will not. Is England to interfere? Are we to have a repetition of the direful history which on both sides now we desire to forget? Is there to be another Battle of the Boyne, another Siege of Derry, another Treaty of Limerick? These things are not only possible, but probable." These were the words spoken by Mr. Disraeli, and I fear he was too good a prophet.

With regard to the question we are now face to face with, I wish to speak, first, as to its effect on the Church, and, second, as to its effect on the people. As to the Church, we have every right to look to the Prime Minister for support. He drew up an elaborate scheme of arrangement for the Church—a scheme conceived with the utmost ability, and with a certain amount of friendliness towards the Church. Synods were formed, and clergy and laity put their heads together, and saved all that could be saved. No institution has been managed with greater ability and success than the organization of the Church of Ireland from the time of the Disestablishment; but now we are brought face to face with a great danger, and threatened with a measure that will throw everything into confusion, and that must put an end to the security not only of property, but of life. How can it be possible to ask the Protestant people in remote districts of the country to remain under the new system of things? We have seen a little of the difficulties that surround such people already. How will it be some years hence? It will be impossible for them to live in the country, and one by one they must disappear; although in the North of Ireland they would be more compact, and, having the assistance of the large body of the Presbyterians, they might hope to hold their own. Ireland would be very different from what it has been, and the future of England would be very much influenced by the change.

With regard to the effect on the people of the country—Is there anything in the proposals of Home Rule which would really conduce to the interests of peace? Would trade be more prosperous, would commerce be improved, would security be greater if the Union was repealed? Would taxation be lighter, would life and property be more secure? I believe everyone who considers the matter must answer the question by saying to himself that he cannot see what chance there is of it. Why should we take such a momentous plunge when the minds of the educated classes and the professional and mercantile classes of the country are against it? Every man of reason is against it, and we are bound to come forward in this and every other Synod and protest against it. The matter has not been thought out. If we were to ask any of the supporters of the change what they propose, even the strongest Nationalist, all the answer we could get is that it would bring some unknown future of unmitigated happiness to Ireland. Could there be any union between the two countries, one governed by two houses and the other by one? Now we have heard of an offer of a gigantic bribe—the expropriation of the landlords. This bears a great similarity to another word—"appropriation." Some years ago we heard a good deal of a clause which was called the Appropriation clause. This led to a division of the Liberal Party and a catastrophe to the Government of the day. Possibly this may happen again. It does not only mean the expropriation of the individuals, but the expropriation of the principles which the ownership of land and the ownership of property represent. What are those principles? They are the principles of thrift, of financial success, of commercial enterprise, and of professional ability. If they expropriate the present landlords of Ireland to-day, they will have another set to-morrow. I am happy to think that there is not any great wish on the part of the landlords and owners of property to leave Ireland, or to leave their humble brethren in the country to contend with the difficulties that surround them. I am sure I may say for the majority of the landlords that they would much rather be allowed to stay in the country than be expropriated and bribed to leave.

There is one other subject to which I wish to call attention, and it is one that appears to be very much misunderstood. I confess myself that until I read in the contemporary publications of what occurred about the year 1799 and 1800—at the time the Union was carried—I, too, was under a misconception. It is supposed that the Union was carried by fraud and bribery. What did I find? That column after column of the newspapers of the day were filled by resolutions passed by bodies of men in every county, and of every religious denomination, absolutely

calling on the Irish Parliament of the day to carry the Union. One of these requisitions was from the Roman Catholics of Kilkenny, which was signed by a Roman Catholic bishop and 204 Roman Catholics of the city of Kilkenny :—

"We are firmly convinced that a complete and entire union between Great Britain and Ireland, founded on equal liberal principles and on a sense of mutual interest and affection, is a measure of wisdom and expediency for this kingdom, and will effectually promote the strength and prosperity of both; and we trust it will afford the surest means of allaying those unhappy distractions, and in time removing those penal exclusions on the score of religion, which have so long prevailed in this country, and by consolidating the resources of both kingdoms oppose the most effectual resistance to the destructive projects of foreign and domestic enemies."

There was a similar one from the Roman Catholics of Cork and from the County of Donegal, bearing over 7,000 signatures :—

"The principle of a legislative union founded on an equality of trade, equality of protection, of constitutional rights and privilege, and of taxation, according to the respective wealth and resources of both kingdoms, meets with our decided approbation. We do not think the apparent difficulty of detail ought to discourage the efforts to accomplish an object that in our opinion will strengthen the empire at large, allay private discontents and religious animosities, and bury for ever the jealousies that are inseparable from a federal connection between distinct and independent nations."

Resolutions in favour of the Union were signed, in 1799, amongst many others, in the counties of Westmeath, Down, Mayo, Meath, Antrim, Derry, Clare, Limerick, Galway, Cork, Kerry, Tyrone, Tipperary; in Donegal by 8,000 Roman Catholics; from Waterford and Cork cities, from the merchants of Limerick, from the Roman Catholics of Longford, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Ardagh, the Bishops of Elphin, of Dromore, and the Roman Catholic clergy and gentry of Kilkenny. It might be said that those addresses were all got up, that they were sent from a central body in Dublin. I only put that forward as an answer that might be made, and I would point out the fact that the resolutions were nearly all different. But I would also put it in this way,—What was the condition of Ireland at the time of the Union? It was in a condition of hopeless misery and wretchedness. The price of Consols in 1799 was $62\frac{5}{8}$—that is a remarkable fact. The country was just recovering from a bloody rebellion which had been suppressed; trade and commerce were everywhere paralysed. Nothing could exceed the misfortune and misery of the country. England was paralysed also by the feeble power which permitted a hostile landing on the coast of Ireland. At that moment Pitt interposed, and said that Ireland would be a more prosperous country united to England. What could be

more natural than that the country should grasp such a prospect? It is true that for some time the country was burdened with severe taxation, which was afterwards lightened by the consolidation of the Exchequers twenty years later. Objections, of course, came from members of the House of Lords and House of Commons, many of whom thought that Ireland would be unjustly taxed by being connected with England; but also many of them thought that they then would lose their seats; and the only fault in connexion with that Union was, that many of those gentlemen had to be conciliated by payment—I think of £15,000 for each seat abolished. But the anticipated benefit has been proved to arise. Let anyone compare the state of Ireland now with what it was before the time of the Union. The proposal to repeal the Union seems now to be perfectly insane. It has been opposed by the judges, by the professional classes, by the magistrates, by the bar, by the Presbyterian and Methodist bodies—in short, by almost every public body in Ireland. The united sense of the country is against it. I might also include the sense and the private wishes of a vast number of the Roman Catholics of this country. How long ago is it since the Cardinal who ruled over this district declared himself against Home Rule—Cardinal MacCabe? How long ago is it since the greatest man in the country—the Right Hon. the present Premier—was opposed to it? Only six weeks ago he changed his mind. Well, Mr. Gladstone has expressed a wish to know the feelings of the country and the opinions of the country upon this question, and I hope that opinion will go forth to him in no uncertain sound—that the intelligence of the Synod and the voice of the Synod are that Mr. Gladstone should abandon any course that would be so insane. The world looks on from the outside with astonishment; the people of every civilized land rub their eyes with surprise that a small country like Ireland, without much capital, should desire to separate from a country like England. The Americans look on and sneer and laugh at the infatuation of the people, and regard the situation as a good safety-valve for the discontent of their own people. In conclusion, I thank the Synod for the patience with which they have listened to me.

The Lord Bishop of Down.—My Lord Archbishop, before you put the resolution so ably moved by my valued friend, the Bishop of Limerick, and seconded by Sir Frederick Heygate, I desire to make a few remarks. Presiding, as I do, over a diocese containing more than one-fourth of all the members of the Church of Ireland, I wish, in their name and my name, to

convey to my dear brethren, lay and clerical, in the south and west, our sympathy and, if needs be, the offer of our material support.

My Lord, though I have presided over the Diocese of Down and Connor and Dromore for over thirty-six years, I cannot tax my memory with ever having taken a part in a political gathering or purely party meeting, and, therefore, if I speak my mind perhaps a little freely and a little boldly, and certainly very candidly, I cannot be accused of being a political partisan, much less an ecclesiastical bigot. In dealing with what must more or less be considered something of a political question, we do not desire as a Synod so to treat it; but I think that the time has arrived when there is a limit to forbearance—when apathy becomes cowardice—when cold indifference to the welfare of the country and the sufferings of our fellow-subjects becomes criminal. I cannot believe that it is possible that there is anyone in this room or outside who can look on Home Rule without deep alarm and the most dire foreboding for the future. Why, you ask me, do I say so? Because if you look to Ireland's history for the last two years, it could be written in disloyalty, in persecutions, in excesses, in outrage, in murders, and in torture of dumb animals. Is this the soil where Home Rule could be expected to bear good fruit, and to bring forth the fruits of righteousness and happiness to a nation? But we are told by the Prime Minister that he has prepared with Home Rule some concurrent scheme that he proposes as a pioneer and to be a forerunner, and it certainly looks very much like an Irish scheme, because it commences with banishing out of the land all the loyal, all the intelligent, all the educated, all the refined, all the landlords of Ireland, and leaves us to be legislated for by the residue. Now, I do not like to employ too strong language, but I think if you want to find out what the residue are likely to be, you have only to read the Right Hon. Baron Dowse's address to the Grand Jury of Kerry. I do not like to describe them, too dreadful as they are; and though it suited Mr. Morley to say that it is only the private opinion of the judge, still I think he must have been wanting somewhat in candour when he said so—for we all perfectly well know the charges given by the judges are not their private opinions as to the crime of the county, but they are founded upon information placed in their hands by vigilant officers, and we have a right to think that they are accurate accounts of the crimes just as they take place. But we are to be somewhat reconciled to this Home Rule. We are to have some material guarantees. Well, I believe there is a great deal of credulity in this world; but I doubt that there is any credulity so great since Moses, that innocent son of the Vicar of Wake-

field—for I don't believe there is anyone can possibly think that these guarantees can be binding. Now, I will do the Nationalists the justice to say that they never promised any guarantees. They have been above-board, and, differing from them as I do, I give them credit for their open speaking and candour. Mr. Parnell, speaking in Cork, said no one had a right to fix or circumscribe the limits of a nation's onward march; and more recently still, when an English statesman asked for guarantees that Ireland would not struggle for complete separation after Repeal of the Union, he (Mr. Parnell) replied that such guarantees were out of the question, as he had none to give. At a later period Mr. Parnell said, when speaking at Cincinnati, that "none of us, whether we are in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

Well, with these open declarations I would like to ask you, what are we to expect? We have been told clearly and distinctly that we are not to look for guarantees by the parties themselves who had the legislation in this matter. What is the outcome? Of course, as loyal Churchmen, as we shall ever be, members of a Church with its honoured traditions and historic name, we may have to submit to Home Rule, remembering—"the powers that be are ordained of God." But if that Home Rule brings in its train, as I fear it will, persecution and oppression—if it tyrannises over the honoured and loved minority of our co-religionists scattered over the south and west of Ireland—if it deprives them of their civil and religious liberty—then, but not till then, we must contend against it by every constitutional means in our power unto the very end. Better to rest in honour in a patriot's grave than to live a living death, stripped of our rights and liberties and robbed of our very faith.

Mr. Richard Bagwell.—My Lord, I am not a Tory nor an Orangeman, nor am I from the province of Ulster; but I am extremely glad to hear from the two last speakers that the province of Ulster does not intend to throw over their brethren in Munster. They are not going to be fooled and bamboozled by the bribe of a separate Ulster Parliament. There are thousands and hundreds of thousands of Roman Catholics as loyal to Queen Victoria as Lord Howard of Effingham was loyal to Queen Elizabeth, when he led her fleets against the Spanish Armada; and of those who are loyal to the Crown, a large proportion are loyal to the Union also. Protestants have no monopoly of loyalty; but while all loyal people are not Protestants, all Protestants, I am glad to say, are loyal. As regards loyalty to the Union, there is one brilliant exception in this Synod—a distinguished logician,

who cannot but admit that he is the exception which proves the rule. I am sure a four-wheeled cab would carry all the disloyal men from this house to College-green. It is said it is all nonsense about the danger to which Protestantism would be exposed; but that is not the question. There are some Protestant M.Ps. who have taken the oath of allegiance to Mr. Parnell; but they in no way represent Protestant feeling. Not one of them, I venture to say, would have the slightest chance of election by any Synod, or any council or vestry, of the Church of Ireland, throughout the length and breadth of the country.

An English stranger who was present at the debates of this Synod, and witnessed the splendid manner in which it conducts its business, left it saying—"I am a Home Ruler, and in favour of handing over Ireland to such a Parliament as that." The answer was at once given to him by an Irishman—"If there were an Irish Parliament, not a single member of that Synod would have the slightest chance of a seat in it."

There is plenty of good material in every class in Ireland, and an Irish Parliament might produce statesmen at last. At first it would fall into the hands of violent men, and I have no wish to risk revolution on the mere chance of some good coming out of it in the end. The resolution rightly says that this is no question of class. This is not a landlords' question. The landlords are only a part of the Protestants of Ireland. The Protestant democracy will be appealed to to throw the landlords over. But let them remember Æsop's fable of the wolves who persuaded the sheep to give up their dogs, and then ate up the sheep.

This question of Repeal of the Union has not been seriously urged for fifty years until three months ago, when a fire-balloon went up from a certain castle near Chester. In 1834 the late Sir Robert Peel delivered an argument against Repeal, every word of which is good now. He said that guarantees were all nonsense. Repeal would necessarily lead to separation, and of the two he preferred separation. English relations with an independent Ireland would, he said, at least be regulated by known principles of international law, whereas those with a federal Ireland would be regulated by no law at all.

Macaulay, the great Whig statesman, was of the same opinion. Sydney Smith said that Repeal was nothing but a piece of anti-British villany.

"Repeal the Union, restore the Heptarchy," was Canning's way of putting it.

Moore, the poet and historian of Ireland, said, "You cannot have Home Rule without separation."

I have heard it said that we should leave this matter to be dealt with by the people of England. I say we should do no such

thing. How could they deal with this subject unless they knew the feeling of the people of Ireland with regard to it? There is a feeling abroad that there is no use opposing Home Rule, because it must come. That is a very dangerous habit of mind. If we dislike Home Rule, we should put our forces into the scale against it. Whether at a Board of Guardians or in the British Parliament, let every man do his part, and then trust to Providence. Every man with a heart and a brain can do something, and is bound to do it at such a time as this. It may be said that, if we fail, our position would be worse than ever. Not a bit of it. There never yet was a victorious army that did not respect a gallant enemy. But if we screw our courage to the sticking-place, we shall not fail. I call upon all Irishmen—I do not care whether they are Protestants or not—to take their share in this matter. They should bear in mind that no guarantees can be given which may not be broken by an omnipotent Parliament. I am certain that Home Rule, that a Parliament established in Dublin, would be ruinous to Ireland, our country, and extremely dangerous to England, which is also our country; and that it would be the beginning of the process of disintegration of the great British Empire.

The resolution was unanimously passed.

The Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.—My Lord, I beg to move:—

"That we contemplate with dismay the social disorder, intimidation, and violence which prevail in many parts of Ireland, due to an agitation, the promoters of which would, it is evident, have paramount influence in a separate Irish Parliament. We, therefore, protest—in common with large numbers of our fellow-countrymen who do not belong to our Church—against the establishment of such a Parliament in this land. We are convinced that so revolutionary a change would only aggravate the peril to civil and religious liberty, and the insecurity of property and life, which now exist. Nor could any guarantees against such dangers be enforced by the Imperial Government in opposition to the will of an Irish Parliament without a recourse to arms."

There are two ideas in the very air we breathe which are well calculated to discourage us. One of these is that opposition on our part may only exasperate the majority of our countrymen, and incline them to treat us with less consideration; therefore, opposition is dangerous. The other idea is still more depressing. In modern politics the party of attack is always stronger than the party of defence; therefore, opposition is useless. To these two ideas I shall confine my remarks, and in discussing them cover most of the propositions in the resolution which I hold in my hand. Opposition is dangerous. Quite possibly. But, then, acquiescence may lead to consequences which will be fatal to the human side of our organization. Let us consider two

points—our ecclesiastical finance and our ecclesiastical freedom. As regards our finance. When our Church was disestablished, we felt the measure keenly. But the mode in which it was carried out was distinguished by certain benevolent conditions. It supplied a framework around which the broken threads of our temporal relations might be looped and worked again into a consistent texture. It was, on the whole, tender to vested rights. It secured certain crumbs and fragments of endowments, and rendered others possible to judicious and self-denying thrift. No political prejudice should hinder us from making the acknowledgment. But, under a voluntary system, the solvency of any financial scheme must depend upon the solvency of the community. In our case, with members not so numerous as we could desire, a very considerable proportion of the "propertied classes," interested in land, commerce, banking, and so forth, the financial system must greatly depend upon the prosperity of those classes. Now, our financial scheme could scarcely subsist, certainly could not prosper, under Home Rule, or any conceivable modification of it. Finance and taxation would be in hands in which no man of business confides, at whose very shadow, uplifted at a little distance, the delicate barometer of the Bank of Ireland and the railway stocks begins to fall to "stormy." We have every reason to suppose that Ireland would be placed under a protective system in its crudest form, enforced by severe penalties. The people would be bitterly disappointed by the meagre performance of splendid promise of prosperity. The landlords would have no more blood for the leeches to suck. Every form of property belongs to a minority; therefore, no species of property would be secure. Even if we were safe from the terror by night of torture or death, there would be a destruction that wasteth at noonday, the abject yet awful thing at whose name honest men shudder as they pronounce it—bankruptcy. Thus, then, our finance would be grievously imperilled. The four chief elements of which it is composed would collapse or disappear, partly from the shrinkage or ruin of property upon which some are secured, partly by the impoverishment or exile of annual contributors. What the locust of disestablishment had spared, the caterpillar and palmerworm of bankruptcy would destroy.

I cannot help thinking that Mr. Gladstone, if approached by persons calculated to insure his attention, might be disposed to give consideration to this aspect of our case, as one which results from his own action in 1869. I remember hearing him in the House of Commons, with his matchless rhetoric, compare the fall of the Irish Church to the fall of Gloster in *Lear*—in fancy, an awful altitude; in fact, his own height upon the sward. My

impression of him is that he will listen to representations on behalf of the Church as he would not do for any other.

I must say one word to those who may think that we make too much of money. I will not dwell upon the melancholy—perhaps, from very intelligible causes, the somewhat too melancholy—witness of 460 of our clergy, drawn together by the *Record*, as a salutary warning for the people of England. There never was a time when an educated clergy was so much needed. The human mind in our century has been sharpened into a weapon of precision, and that weapon has been turned against Christianity itself. In such a juncture we may turn with pride to the books that have been written by two honoured members of our Synod—to that book by the Provost of Trinity College, in which an apparently almost boundless amplitude of imagination is yet confined within the strictest lines of the severest logic; and then again to that other work by another distinguished member of the Synod—the Regius Professor of Divinity—in which every brick has been carefully rung before it was laid, and built up into a majestic fabric of constructive criticism. I cannot but think of these books, and of their value to the Church of Christ. Now, behind all these things there is the liberal education, and behind the liberal education there are the schools and the University, and behind that money.

But, further, our ecclesiastical liberty might be in danger. There are, I am perfectly sure, very many Roman Catholics, laymen and clergy, to whom we might trust our rights and our freedom. But in every system there are influences which are stronger than individuals; and we are constantly overhearing sentences which scarcely inspire us with confidence. When we hear it laid down as an absolute right that the hierarchy is *de jure* entitled to a ruling voice in selecting candidates to be returned to Parliament—entitled also to a clear majority on all commissions, in many of which we have a prescriptive right and important interests—we do not feel quite assured. A certain letter of the Father Provincial of the Jesuits in England has lately seen the light. What does its able writer say? "My own opinion is that if Home Rule can be gained, it will certainly be a great step towards the destruction of Protestant ascendancy." That letter was written in June, 1873, and must refer to Ireland. But the Irish Church Establishment—the last vestige of Protestant ascendancy—was dead and buried for four years. What can the sentence mean? It must mean that, in the estimate of the writer, our existence and our ascendancy are convertible terms. That is scarcely a doctrine which reconciles us to Home Rule, even less so than

the dogma of the "unboiled justice," which, we are told, must be our portion. Full religious liberty—as M. Guizot pointed out in arguing on behalf of French Roman Catholics—includes two elements, one of which is personal, the other aggregate or ecclesiastical. Religious liberty consists not only in my personal isolated right to worship God according to my conscientious convictions. The general condition of the religious community to which a man belongs, its relations to its ministers and to other communities, its assemblages for debate, present a wide field. Can anyone be assured that his expressions of opinion in our Church gatherings may not be visited with penalties—that our Diocesan, and even our General, Synod may not be crushed as insulting to the majority of Irishmen? I, therefore, conclude that if we acquiesce in Home Rule, we shall acquiesce in that which must be fatal to our finance, and may be fatal to our liberty.

"But," it may be said, "you have forgotten the guarantees and provisions which may be devised." We have three reasons for distrusting them. The first is drawn from the fifth article of the Act of Union and from Catholic Emancipation. To those who talk of them we answer. "Earth can supply no promises more jealously guarded than those which you have torn up. Heaven itself has no sanctions more august than those which have been violated with a smile." But we have a second and stronger reason for distrusting guarantees. Facts are stubborn things; but defined principles are prolific of all future facts. We have now the received casuistry of guarantees. In former generations statesmen accepted the dogma of the continuity of a nation's moral life. The death of individuals was but an accident in that august conception of a permanent faith, of a great faith, of a great people's honour. But we have become political Sadducees, for whom the dead live not at all. The dead have no right to bind the living. This is a good specimen of the way in which an empire consolidated by heroic facts falls into pieces before the manufacturers of happy phrases. But, thirdly, even if we look no further forward than the next few months, have the Nationalists any leaders accredited to negotiate with us for guarantees? No guarantee, therefore, will induce us willingly to accept a separate Parliament, or an elective National Council, or four Councils, or any one-chambered Irish Parliament, which means a one-ideaed vestry. It is the thing, not the name, we object to. Our gorge rises at the tartar emetic, though the doctor soothingly calls it antimonial wine. We desire to remain an integral part of an Imperial people. We and our fathers have lived under the shadow of a great tree, the stately growth of a thousand summers of glory. We will not exchange it for a place

under a big tree, which sophisters and experimentalists have taken a fancy to plant head downward, whose sure fall will crush us amidst the inextinguishable laughter of the world.

The second discouraging idea is that our opposition is useless, because we are few and feeble. The question, it is said by some, is one of arithmetic. But we are really part of the vast majority of the Empire. And even from the local standpoint our strength is underrated. We are over 600,000. Our Presbyterian fellow-countrymen, 500,000, are with us. The fact that they are very largely Liberal in their political opinions gives much greater importance to their judgment. They have spoken with a Christian moderation and logical precision worthy of their great traditions. I know not what the precise number of the Irish Methodists may be. We may safely assume 60,000, and we have them with us. I will venture to add something more. I have no doubt that we have substantially with us about half a million of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. I will not now speak of the rights of free opinion and liberal education, in which they may find our assistance so important. But I will venture to say to them, as religious men, that the credit of their form of Christianity is at stake. Before the Reformation no candid man can deny that the power of the Roman See was frequently used to alleviate tyranny. Afterwards, however, when the principle of her authority was contested, the administrators of the Roman See contracted an alliance with despotism and arbitrary power. In every case the alliance proved fatal to both—to the temporal absolutism and to the spiritual system which used it as a prop. Men who are most deeply attached to the Roman Church as a teacher of faith wince and writhe under the facts of history. The old monarchical despotisms have passed away. But a new absolutism is rising, of which the most complete specimen is afforded by Ireland. It is the system of voting mechanically, by platoons, of which ecclesiastics do not hesitate to avail themselves. But will this tyranny last? No. It cannot last for economical reasons. It will be found before long that the wreck of landlordism is not so much the dawn of a social millennium as of a social ruin. The instructors will be left far behind by the pupils to whom they have taught the first elements of the fascinating science of rebellion, and of the still more fascinating art of confiscation. The people in their misery will turn upon those who spurred their fury, who committed the crime of mistaking a people's wishes for a people's wants. Nor can it last morally. Civilized humanity, all that is sound in Christendom, will ask how it has happened that a character so tender, so graceful, so chivalrous, so witty as the Irish, has deteriorated so sadly, become so associated with a hideous

tautology of crime. Thus an apparent alliance of a particular form of the Christian religion with the new democratic despotism will throw as much discredit upon it as ever did the old alliance with monarchical despotism. An apostle speaks of the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left. He does not speak of intimidation on the right hand and repudiation on the left. Theological dogma advances to a fatal triumph over a trampled Decalogue. Religion is the royal daughter of heaven. Her crown falls from her head in the sight of men as well as of angels, when she stoops to profit by the crimes which it is her duty to denounce and her glory to subdue. This is not abstract speculation. It is the apprehension of some of the wisest and best men in the Church of Rome. I appeal to one who bore the double aureole of sanctity and genius, the celebrated Dominican, Father Burke, who was educated in the influence of that "Perugian band" created by the present Pope. Thus he wrote in 1882—"Never was a people so completely changed, and so rapidly. The Ireland that I used to talk of, and love to think of, is completely vanished. Nothing remains for such as me but to die." A remarkable article in the *Spectator* (February 27, 1886) enables us to fill up certain gaps. Thus Father Burke said—"There seems nothing to give to the starving children after we have paid him the enormous debt we owe him for making us atheists and murderers." He assured the writer of the article more than once that "when the revolution he foresaw had wreaked its passion on owners of property, the priesthood would be the next prey." I hope that there may be some of my countrymen who will take these words as a message of peace from one who neither in the chamber nor elsewhere has been accused of being an ultra-Protestant fanatic.

I say now what I have always said. For me the day declines. As I draw near the top of the hill, all who have the sunshine on their face are dear to me, because they are turned to the light. I remember the kindly old priest who said to me as I left my first parish, thirty years ago, "I believe that through one Saviour we shall meet in one heaven." The historian of the English rebellion tells how, sitting among his friends, Lord Falkland often, after a deep silence and frequent sighs, "would ingeminate, Peace! peace!" I believe that Ireland has many such. There was a time when the Irish policy of England was to govern the many by the few. The project now is to govern the few by the many. The true policy is to govern both the few and the many with judgment and justice. Not the less must we contend in this Synod, as we best may, for Church and country. This is not the place for mock heroics. We have no daggers to fling upon the floor. But it is the place for the better heroics of

faith, and hope, and charity. There are more with us than we can march through the streets. We have really with us probably a million and three-quarters of people. We are compassed about with a great cloud of witnesses. We have silent auxiliaries and voiceless prayers among those who are counted as of the hostile camp. Our opponents boast of a majority of more than three to one at the poll. We have ten to one on our side of all that reasons most justly, feels most tenderly, prays most truly, works most honestly. We have been called a "feeble folk." Yes! but we have made our house in the rock. It may be that He whose will is the final arbiter of destiny will turn away the edge of our sword, and give us no victory in the battle. But the history of freedom, like that of truth, is the history of the triumph of minorities. And if we fail, the voice of civilized humanity will be wanting neither in sympathy with us, nor in reprobation of those who shall abandon to an intolerable bondage the sons of fathers whose blood has cemented the temple of British liberty.

Colonel John ffolliott.—My Lord Archbishop, it is with feelings of pain I rise to second the resolution, because this is the first time that I am aware of, that the word "politics" has been permitted to be uttered in our Synod, and nothing but the very grave peril that menaces us would have induced your Grace and the bishops of our Church to sanction such a course on this occasion. I am unwilling to say a word that can be unnecessarily offensive to any man; but I hold it to be the duty of every man to speak distinctly and strongly his opinion of crimes that are abhorrent to Christian morality—and not to Christian morality alone, but to that of the earliest ages of which we have any record, and, uninfluenced by the political fashion of the hour or the godless theories to be found in some magazines and reviews, to express his loathing both of the crimes and of the men who commit or approve them. It is generally admitted that there is but one excuse for rebellion against a settled government, and that is, that it is intolerably bad. Irishmen have twice within my lifetime thought it necessary to rebel, although living under a constitution and laws, with all their shortcomings, still the best in the world; and notwithstanding that at the time Ireland was progressing more rapidly in civilization and prosperity than any nation in Europe.

And now we have two Governments in Ireland—one called the established Government, and another which works in secret and in the dark, and which is intolerably bad.

If England saw some weak nation in Asia or Africa in the condition in which Ireland now is, I believe she would send an

army to restore order. She has shed rivers of blood in Egypt, and spent eleven millions of money, because there was some disorder there, and because the securities of some Englishmen were in jeopardy. They have made war on Burmah because the Government of that country was intolerably bad; and England, which centuries ago undertook the responsibility of preserving peace and security for life and property in Ireland, could now, with a stroke of a pen, restore order without a drop of bloodshed, without hardship to any individual. It is not much to demand that it shall be done. We come not here to demand anything unjust, unfair, or unreasonable. We come to proclaim our loyalty, and to claim the performance of the reciprocal obligation, by giving us just government. And yet, when we demand it, we are told that the majority desire something different.

Has Government no other duty than to obey the will of a majority in any province of the Empire? Are wisdom, knowledge, ability, and the influence earned by an honourable character, to be of no effect? It is an evil day for the country when all these are thrown away in panic, as a cowardly soldier throws away his arms, and men bow down to the many-headed tyrant. It is sad to see poor men led to look for a better condition by means which can only destroy the sources from which their necessities are supplied, and it is the duty of Government to protect them from the effects of their ignorance.

And that majority, too, of which we hear so much, is far less than would appear. Mr. Bright, a man who has passed an honoured life as the strenuous supporter of popular rights—the author of the famous expression, "Force is no remedy"—what does he say of this majority in favour of Home Rule? That there cannot be at most more than a million of grown-up men in favour of it, and of these there are not one-half who have any knowledge of politics or public matters.

We are told we are to expect nothing but what are called remedial measures—these so-called remedial measures being to put the authors of the present disorder into a position of greater authority and dignity; to invest men who have suffered the penalty of murderous conspiracy, or who have fled to escape the punishment due to their crimes, with all the authority now exercised by the Imperial Parliament. What magic is there in Home Rule to change the nature of these men? Will plenitude of power convert a Robespierre into a Cavour?

Remedial measures! I have never objected to them. I rejoice that I pay for the support of my Church, and that no reproach can be urged against it. I should rejoice that I have been made poor by the operation of the Land Act could I see my neighbours contented and peaceful, with feelings of goodwill instead of hatred in their breasts.

Coercion, in any true sense of the word, I object to as strongly as any man; but I hold it absurd to apply the term to provisions necessary to enable just and mild laws to be enforced by the gentle persuasion of the Royal Irish Constabulary.

I am truly patriotic, but in a somewhat larger sense than that of the so-called Nationalists. Irish patriotism was formerly provincial—one district and one chief against another; now it is two-thirds (say) of Ireland against the remaining third, and against England. Yet I do not despise the sentiment; I should sympathise with it if I saw that it was such as an honest man could allow himself to be associated with; but I must first see on the side of patriotism sentiments of honesty, justice, and mercy. I agree with the illustrious Irishman, Burke, that "liberty without honesty and justice is worthless." But what do I see? I will not judge men unfairly; I will judge them by their acts and by their words. Their acts you all know too well; as for their words, they have one voice—a very gentle voice—in the British Parliament, a voice of villainous import in Ireland, and in America absolutely ferocious. The foremost men in the movement have there spoken of the crime which disgusted Europe, when two blameless and highminded men were butchered in cold blood in our Phœnix Park, as a "victory" at which the Irish race rejoiced.

This is the class of men to whom it is proposed to confide the government of the country! Their own followers are suffering from their tyranny. I have known many cases where men who have been coerced to become prominent men in the National League have expressed their detestation of its tyranny and brutality.

We are told that there is not so much crime now—there is a truce, as it is called; but it is only a very partial truce. Certainly we have not had so many murders; but the tyranny is not in the slightest degree abated. And they have plainly told us that they are ready at any moment to renew their murderous work. It is perfectly clear that the Prime Minister has no confidence as to the future peace of the country, for he has thought it necessary to bring in an Act, concurrently with that for Home Rule, for the protection of the owners of land. But supposing the owners of land are protected, what is to become of those loyalists who are not owners of land? Are they to be left to their fate, or is the country to be restored to order at the point of the bayonet? I have myself too many good and honoured Roman Catholic friends to allow me to say one word against them, or to think hardly of them. They are as loyal men as any in the country. There have been some utterances of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics lately, and I admit they are perfectly sincere in their

assurances that it is their deliberate intention that there shall be no injustice done to Protestants under Home Rule. I will go further and assume—and it is much to assume—that the whole traditions and character of the Roman Catholic Church are totally different from what they were in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, and in centuries much nearer than that. But at the same time I must remember that there are also the utterances of distinguished ecclesiastics of that Church now living, who speak in a very different tone ; and is it not possible that those ecclesiastics who now speak words of assurance and moderation may be carried on by a power that they will be unable to resist, and that they may have to revert to the ancient traditions and rules of their Church ? Are they satisfied to try so fearful an experiment as Home Rule ? I am told that we need have no fears, that if any injustice were done us, England would send soldiers to Ireland. Is it not a horrible thing to think that there should be such an alternative, that Ireland would have again to be reconquered in order to restore peace in it ? May God avert such disasters, either that there should be a base desertion of good and tried men in the country whom England is bound to protect by every tie of honour, or that she should have to resort to the horrible alternative of shedding the blood of misguided men who might have been saved by a more courageous and honourable policy.

The Lord Bishop of Cork.—In the county with which I am connected, there are many glorious roads running along by the sea-coast, or winding amongst some of our beautiful mountains ; and I often heartily wish that the condition of our country was happier and more peaceful, and that a greater number of friends from across the Channel and other parts of the Empire could be induced to visit it and enjoy the scenery of that lovely region. It is a pleasant thing to sit on the box-seat of one of the coaches and enjoy those glorious views ; but I confess I should feel a little anxious if, when passing along some of the roads, I observed one of the horses becoming restive and kicking over the traces, and if the driver said to me, "I must throw down the reins, I must give up driving ; I cannot go on any longer." I confess I should feel a little apprehensive, and would come to the conclusion, naturally enough, that the driver was either afraid or unable to control his horses, and that if he did throw down the reins, in all probability the coach would be upset. But the case might be still worse, because if it should so happen that the other animals followed the bad example of the one, and if three of the horses began to kick and plunge, and to exhibit an unruly temper, then if the coachman said to

me, "I must throw down the reins, but I will not do it yet; I shall wait for a few moments for those tourists that I see coming down the hill—till they take out of the traces the one horse that is working along quietly and patiently, and then I shall throw down the reins." Well, in that case, I should have a very tolerable certainty indeed that if he followed that course the coach would be upset. That is very much the position in which we are now placed. It seems to me that we must come to this conclusion when we contemplate what is now proposed—that the great English nation, the great Imperial Parliament, is either afraid or unwilling to take the trouble to govern this country. We see England stretching forth her hands, and taking in new empires under her control; but she seems unwilling to devote her powers of organization to the control and government of this little country—even supposing that it has proved unruly. And when we look at our own country, and the condition of this island, is there much to lead us to suppose that, if she did attain to self-government, all would go smoothly and well? We who have been abstaining from political discussion and action have been quietly observing what has been going on around us in all parts of this island. We have seen the action of the different elected boards in this country, and has anything we have seen in those boards inclined us to believe that the members who compose such boards would constitute a Parliament fit for the government of this country? Have we not seen continually an inclination to get rid of practical work? Have we seen the boards of the cities and counties devoting themselves to the real work assigned to them? Have we not seen them rather ready to throw aside all considerations of this kind, and to devote themselves to political questions, and to devising imaginary remedies for political evils? Do these things lead us to expect a happy state of things if the government of this country were taken from the Imperial Parliament, and were to devolve upon a local Legislature? And then we see, as those who dwell in the south—and I, coming from the city of Cork, have seen plenty of it during the past winter—I have seen, under the force of agitation, the people of that city compelled to resist and to oppose a company engaged in trade and commerce which was eminently for the benefit of the whole people. I have seen an Irish company started by the subscriptions of Irish people, and I have seen that company attacked. I have seen the people of the city of Cork driven on by the force of agitation to resist a company that was willing to sell coal at a cheap rate to the poor people during the winter, and in that way I have seen the power of agitation used to do direct injury to the people themselves. Am I to believe, then, that there is a hopeful or cheerful

prospect for us if the government of the country be transferred from the Imperial to a local Parliament?

We have heard a good deal of the system of boycotting, and we know what its horrors have been throughout the country. Can we hide them from ourselves? We should remember what was the origin of that system, and from what that system sprang. Allusion has been already made, in the powerful and splendid language of the Bishop of Derry, to the divisions which exist in this country on religious questions. I think it is well to bring that subject before you. For one of the most serious considerations to my mind is this—that the people of England refuse to see—deliberately refuse to see—that the religious difficulty has anything to do with the subject before them. We are often charged with bigotry when we bring in the religious question; but if a statesman who has to solve the problems presented by the condition of the country shuts his eyes to the religious difficulty, and refuses to see it, that statesman does not take in all the conditions of the problem, and must fail in his efforts. What has been the origin of the system of boycotting in this country? It arose immediately, no doubt, from a speech made by one of the leaders of the agitation; but it did not spring from the magic of Mr. Parnell's power. It sprang originally —and we say it with no feeling of bitterness—from the power of the Roman Catholic system, and the habit of mind formed among those who submit to the discipline of that Church. I doubt if boycotting could continue to exist among a people not accustomed to the discipline of that Church. Those who have been concerned for years in dealing religiously with the people of this country know well that this is the source from which that system sprang. There is a clergyman in my diocese at the present time who was, some years back, living as a curate in the island of Cape Clear; and during one of the winter seasons there, when the island could not be approached for some weeks, the clergyman had to burn the chairs of his sitting-room, because he was not allowed to obtain fuel on the island. What was that but the same system that has now sprung into such terrible power throughout the land? Now, what does that lead us to fear? It leads us to fear that in the future there will be terrible danger, not only to civil but religious liberty.

When we hear the utterances of some of the Romish ecclesiastics of the present day—powerful men—astute men—we are led to think of the effort they are making to retain their power over the people. No doubt, they think they will wield the power of the democracy, and cause the power of the Church to be triumphant in the midst of the storm. Possibly, however, they may not succeed. Are we to suppose, however, that they will not

make the effort? A remarkable letter has lately been published, which shews what the views and aims of those are who guide the policy of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. I have listened to the words uttered by the Bishop of Derry, and as the bishop of a southern diocese, I would make a similar appeal to my fellow-countrymen from whom we differ, but whose religious convictions we sincerely respect. Do the educated Roman Catholics of this country desire that the control of the education of their sons should be unreservedly placed in the hands of ecclesiastics? I believe they do not. And is not this one of those things which will inevitably follow in the immediate future if Home Rule be granted? Do the Nonconformist bodies of England desire this for Ireland? It appears by their action that they do, forgetful of their own struggles. I appeal to them not to take a selfish view of this great question. We have met here to enter our protest on behalf of civil and religious liberty; and we call upon all who value freedom to stand by us, as we believe that the cause we espouse is that of liberty and truth, and that its triumph will promote the welfare and prosperity of the whole country.

The resolution was then put to the meeting and unanimously adopted.

The Lord Bishop of Ossory.—My Lord Archbishop, the terms of the resolution which I wish to bring before the Synod are these:—

"That we hereby record our devotion to the interests of the great Empire of which this United Kingdom is the centre—a devotion intensified by our attachment to the country of our birth. We recognise the advantage and honour we derive from our present Imperial position, and the conspicuous place which Irishmen have long held among those to whom the Empire owes its prosperity and its fame. We therefore protest, in the interests both of our country and of the Empire, against any measure that could endanger the legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, believing that such a step would lead to the complete separation of these countries, and to the consequent dismemberment and humiliation of the Empire as a whole."

I am afraid it may be sometimes thought in this place that the bishops do not speak enough. But that charge cannot be made to-day. Out of the eight bishops present we have already heard five, and I suppose you wish to have the good half-dozen. I travelled lately in company with a Roman Catholic gentleman, who said, "You seem to be taking a leaf now out of the book of our bishops. You are calling a meeting of the Synod of your Church, and you are about to have a declaration of opinion." "Yes," I replied, "with this difference—we ask our laity as well as our clergy to come and meet us and express their own opinions." "I wish, my Lord," the gentle-

man continued, "our bishops would do the same thing. They would hear something they don't know, and perhaps they would hear something that they would not like." It is a happy thing that we—the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church of Ireland—are now met to express our calm, and fearless, and honest convictions which we desire to place on record in this important crisis. And here I am reminded to say that I have received a letter from my brother of Cashel—whose duty I am doing—written from Egypt, and expressing his hearty concurrence with the object of this meeting. We would also have had with us, but for ill-health, the Bishops of Meath and Tuam. And we have with us, although I regret he is not on the platform, the Bishop-elect * of Armagh; so that the whole Bench is accounted for. It has been sometimes thought that we should be Churchmen first and Irishmen afterwards; but my opinion is that we should be Churchmen and Irishmen at the same time. It is because we feel that the interests of our country are inseparably bound up with our interests as a Church, that we have met together to express our loyal, religious patriotism. Sometimes it is thought that because of our Imperial connexion we cease to be patriots and to love our own country. But we may ask does any Scotchman—and Scotchmen have noble and glorious recollections—they had a race of kings long after the Irish kings ceased to exist—love his country less, the "land of brown heath and shaggy wood," because Scotland is represented in the Imperial Parliament? Do Welshmen, who have national peculiarities and traditions of their own, and a language which they have done more to preserve than has been done by Irishmen to preserve the Irish language, consider themselves less in love with their Welsh Principality, because of their Imperial connexion? No; they are patriots in the truest sense, and so are we; and our love for our country is quite as strong as and at the same time much wiser than that of those who challenge it. The resolution says, and says truly, that our devotion is "intensified by our attachment to the country of our birth." And why? Because Irishmen have for ages shared the glory, and the honour, and the advantages of the Imperial connexion; and because there are no fields of enterprise, no fields of discovery, no positions of honour, in which they are not found side by side with their English brethren. Looking back over the roll of illustrious Irishmen who have won their way to fame, even in our own day, side by side with their English brethren, we find the Lawrences, the Burkes, the Napiers and the Wellesleys, the M'Clures and the M'Clintocks, the Dufferins and the Wolseleys, and hosts of others. Are we ready to separate ourselves from

* Very Rev. William Reeves, D.D., Dean of Armagh.

the glorious history of the Empire, and sink down to the level of a petty State? We are not content to do that, and, therefore, we stand together for the great connexion which has brought us such honour and advantage. It is not, however, from merely selfish motives that we do this. We believe that any weakening or severance of the tie would be injurious to Great Britain as well as to ourselves. We believe it would lead to misunderstandings and misconceptions, and eventually to unfortunate collisions which we would all deplore, and therefore our very patriotism makes it desirable to maintain the connexion. If once the silly cry of "Ireland for the Irish" takes the form of legislative acts of Home Rule or Repeal of the Union, there will probably be another cry heard—and an unfortunate cry it would be for the Irish people—the cry of "England for the English." It has been said that guarantees with regard to future policy in this country could not be given, and it has been well observed that no guarantees have ever been promised. It may then be well to ask who are the men who would be paramount in any Parliament that might be the result of the present agitation? I hold in my hand a document, and it is no breach of confidence to refer to it, because it was a public declaration made at a very important time. It is the famous manifesto which issued from Kilmainham Gaol. I need not read the names attached to it ("read, read"). Well, as you wish me to read them, first there was Charles Stewart Parnell, President, Kilmainham Gaol; and then followed—A. J. Kettle, Honorary Secretary, Kilmainham Gaol; Michael Davitt, Honorary Secretary, Portland Prison; Thomas Brennan, Honorary Secretary, Kilmainham Gaol; John Dillon, Head Organizer, Kilmainham Gaol; Thomas Sexton, Head Organizer, Kilmainham Gaol; and Patrick Egan, Treasurer, Paris. That gentleman managed, somehow, to keep out of danger. Now, why do I refer to this? The great doctrine taught in this document was absolution from the necessity of paying rent; and a very palatable doctrine it was to many. Let me cull one or two sentences from this manifesto. "One constitutional weapon alone," it says, "now remains in the hands of the Irish National Land League. It is the strongest, the swiftest, the most irresistible of all." Then it goes on to say that the executive of the Land League "feels bound to advise the tenant-farmers of Ireland from this forth to pay no rent under any circumstances to their landlords until the Government relinquishes the existing system of terrorism." They might as well say to us in this Synod, that we are not to pay our tailors until it is seen whether Mr. Gladstone passes the Act which he is holding in terror over us. The manifesto continues: "Do not suffer yourselves to be intimidated by threats of military violence. It is as

lawful to refuse to pay rents as it is to receive them." "One more crowning struggle for your land, your homes, your lives"—"Stand together in the face of the brutal and cowardly enemies of your race; pay no rents under any pretext." This is simply the gospel of Communism. It is not repeal of the Union, but repeal of the Eighth Commandment! It contains the very essence of Socialism. I do not believe that since the days of Wat Tyler there was anything that struck more at the root of social order and religion than that document. Yet that was the doctrine preached by the men who now seek to get the government of Ireland into their own hands. It was not surprising when that document appeared, to find that it met with a withering protest from an ecclesiastic of the Church of Rome. Archbishop Croke, of Cashel (a prelate not inclined to be too severe on the Home Rule party), declared that he had read it with pain and dismay—that it struck at the very root of morals and religion, and that nothing could come of it but disintegration and defeat. Neither was it surprising to find that, not long after that document made its appearance, there came a rescript from a higher authority at Rome desiring the priesthood of this country not to lend their countenance to the tribute which was got up in favour of the first signatory to that manifesto. But we are surprised that the men who signed this dishonest manifesto now come forward to ask us to trust them and give them our confidence. It is surprising that such men, after ignoring the commandments of the Decalogue, and striking at the root of all interest between man and man, should ask us to put the smallest trust in their protestations or their promises. Even if we were fully convinced that legislative independence was the best thing for our native land, it is not to men of this stamp, or of these principles (or rather want of principles), that we would entrust our liberty or our lives. Are we ready to accept them as our rulers, with an irresponsible dictator at their head, who holds the manhood of Ireland in leading-strings, and has shown by the manifesto which I have just quoted that he and his followers are ready to keep or to break public engagements just as it may best suit their ulterior purposes? Not if we can help it. It is no wonder when patriotism puts on the robes of dishonesty, that hatred, malice, and uncharitableness should follow in its wake. We need not speak of the evils that followed the appearance of that document. The history of our country, ever since, has been such as to fill us with shame, pity, and indignation; shame that our country should be dishonoured in the face of the world; pity for a generous but misguided people who have been so demoralized by agitation; and indignation against those who have been throwing them back into a kind of primitive barbarism. The preachers of this new gospel have gone

forth ; one of them came to my own district of Kilkenny, to preach the gospel of boycotting. And he told his audience that "there was no law of God or man against that system." Surely if the laws of man are not opposed to boycotting—and I leave that for the consideration of the magistrate—boycotting is opposed to the laws of Him who taught us "to do unto others as we would they should do unto us," and who went further and said, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use and persecute you." Yet this gospel of boycotting is the gospel preached by the men who would be paramount in any Parliament set up in this country. So long as the maxim remains for us on the sacred page—"Righteousness exalteth a nation "—it would be impossible for us to believe that such men could lead this country to honour, prosperity, or repose. As for our own Church, let us put our trust in Him who has carried us through darker days even than those through which we are now passing. Let us cleave fast to her and to her principles. She is not a Latin Church, she is not a Greek Church, and she is not even an English Church. She is the Church of Ireland by her ancient traditions and her glorious descent. I am glad to hear the statement made by a layman that the laity of the country are not disposed to desert their country or their Church in the hour of danger. They have a serious responsibility cast upon them, and never did that responsibility weigh upon them more than now. I will close by saying to all my brethren, lay and clerical, in the words of the Psalmist, full as they are of exhortation, encouragement, and hope—"Put thou thy trust in the Lord, and be doing good ; dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed."

Rev. George Salmon, d.d., f.r.s.—My Lord, I have not come forward to speak on this occasion of my own choice, for speechmaking is not in my line ; but when called on to take a part in the proceedings, I have not felt myself at liberty to refuse. An educated man living in this country would have cause to be ashamed if he took no interest in the question, what measures would promote its welfare, or if he did not care to form an opinion on the subject ; and equal cause to be ashamed if he was afraid to express his opinion when asked it by those who had a right to demand it of him. It really requires some courage now for one who thinks as I do to speak his mind on this subject; for the conditions of free speaking have changed a good deal from what I can remember. I remember when a man who expressed hostility to England, and a desire for separation from her, if he did not make himself liable to an action for sedition, would incur severe opprobrium for his disloyalty. Now a man who avows his belief that the happiness of Ireland would

best be promoted by drawing close the ties that bind her to England, becomes a mark for obloquy and misrepresentation; he is said not to love his country; he is said to be an enemy to Ireland.

Would you be thought an enemy to a young lady if you expressed to her your belief that she would be happier married than single? Suppose you were consulted by a young married lady, a friend of yours, who was not on as good terms with her husband as you could wish her to be; suppose she was anxious for a separation, and talked much of the independence she would gain by it, would you be thought her enemy, would you be thought to have no concern for her welfare, if you told her that she was under a delusion—that separation would be injurious to both parties, and to her would mean loss of wealth, worldly position, respectability, and that her happiness depended on reconciling her differences with her consort? It is because I love Ireland that I protest against a separation which, I believe, would be injurious to England and fatal to Ireland.

As for the effects on England, we have only to remember that the process by which all nations have become great has been by absorbing small nationalities. Canning cried, "Repeal the Union, restore the Heptarchy." What place would England have had in the world's history if the Heptarchy had not been absorbed? Still, even in the time of Elizabeth, England was but a poor country, owing the preservation of her national existence to the mutual jealousies of France and Spain. Her union with Scotland was a necessary condition for her greatness. How Scotch patriots fought against that union; how bitter was the feeling between the two countries even a hundred years ago! Is there any Scotchman now who regrets that union, or who would think it anything short of calamitous to his country if it had not taken place? How has France become great but by the welding of separate provinces into a homogeneous mass? The Plantagenet kings won triumphs in France; they did not conquer what we now call France, but a country weak because it was divided. How was Prussia able, in our own time, to make retaliation for the humiliations she suffered at the hands of the great Napoleon? He triumphed over a Germany helpless because split up into a number of petty, mutually jealous states. But in our day Prussia, fighting a hard battle against what was called "Particularismus," forced a number of these little states, in many cases very sore against their will, into one body, and when Germany was thus consolidated, France could no longer make head against her. I will not recall the story how Italy has in our time been transformed from being a "geographical expression," to a country entitled to a place in the family of great

European nations. But I will remind you of what you can remember took place in America. As far as I understand the law of their Constitution, the Southern States had a perfect right to separate from the Northern if they were so minded. But the Northern States, when asked to submit to such a separation, decided that civil war was preferable. You know what sacrifices of money, of valuable lives, were necessary to conquer the heroic resistance of the South. But what evil or inconvenience that the North could have suffered from the existence of an independent nation in the South is within many degrees comparable to the danger to England from an independent Ireland? Just imagine that England was at war. Would Ireland be disposed to contribute men or money to a war in which she might feel no interest, and in the making of which she had had no voice? Is it certain that she would not throw open her harbours and in other ways give aid and comfort to the enemies of England? The first step England would have to take in any war would be the reconquest of Ireland. And as for what is publicly avowed as likely to happen—a peaceful war of tariffs—would that be a small evil?

There are those who think that some middle term could be found between preservation of the Union and separation—some way of refusing what people want, and contenting them by giving them what they don't want. It has been talked of setting up a Parliament in Dublin for the purpose of passing local bills—as if what was now stirring the minds of the Irish people was the grievance that capitalists getting up a railway bill have to pay a little too much in preliminary expenses—or a Parliament guarded by restrictions. Every one of these restrictions would be denounced as a badge of servitude, and would give rise to a new agitation. Either the restrictions would never come into play, and then they would be a gratuitous cause of offence and heartburning, or else they would amount to a veto put by the English Parliament on something for which the Irish Parliament had solemnly expressed its desire, and then the conflict between the two countries would be revived in a far more formidable shape than at present.

I have reminded you how in our generation other countries have given us examples of the process by which weak nations become strong, small nations become great. Must it be that our generation is also to see England illustrate the process by which great nations become small, when they fall to pieces because they have become too flabby to have energy to hold their component parts together? One man cannot understand another man's temptations. I do not understand the temptations of ambition. I am unable to conceive how a statesman advanced in life could

feel an inducement to grasp at a few months' uncertain, uncomfortable tenure of office merely that he might go down to posterity as having inaugurated the disintegration of the British Empire.

But there are many in this country who would not be much concerned to find it proved to them that England would be injured by a separation. What then? Ireland would gain; she would become a nation. How people will let themselves be deluded by words! A nation! What kind of a nation? A nation without an army, without a navy, without military stores, with little money to provide them, with unprotected ports, lying within three hours' sail of another more numerous and powerful nation, possessed of army and navy and every means of making its neighbour obey its will. That was the position Napoleon planned for England in the early part of this century. He succeeded in making his military power predominant; but England by means of her navy preserved her independence. But suppose Napoleon had succeeded in making himself as powerful by sea as he was by land, would England have been a nation then? She might call herself a nation; but in real truth she would have been a province of France. It makes no difference whether Napoleon would have formally declared her so, or whether he would have set up one of his brothers as her sovereign, or graciously have permitted her to be governed by native rulers. Call her as you please, she would have been no nation, but a province.

Perhaps I may be told that the analogy I have cited is not a fair one—that England would have no wish to interfere with us as Napoleon would have interfered with England. I dare say not. Napoleon would surely, if he could, have robbed England; for England, even then, was well worth robbing; but the wealth of Ireland, it must be owned, offers little temptation to invaders. But just think what a noble ambition is held out to us. To be a nation upon sufferance, existing through the contemptuous toleration of our neighbours, not meddled with because we were too poor to offer any money, too feeble to be able to render any services which it would be thought worth while to exact—a toleration which we might enjoy as long as we were paupers, but which we should forfeit if ever we made ourselves rich and prosperous. Compare with that the position we enjoy at present: members on equal terms of a nation holding a foremost rank among the peoples of the world. There is no triumph she can gain in which we may not have our full share—no place of honour in her councils to which we may not aspire. I was born a citizen of a great nation: I do not want to become a citizen of what would be one of the most beggarly nations on the earth.

Let me say something as to the financial position of a separated

Ireland. Some of you, perhaps, may have an opportunity of judging. Some of you are landlords, and perhaps you may be bought out. Which would you prefer—to invest what may be given you in three per cent. consols, guaranteed by the English Parliament, or in a six per cent. stock guaranteed by an Irish Parliament? I cannot tell which you would prefer; but I can very well judge which English capitalists would prefer. I judge it from what you all know—the decline in the Stock Exchange quotations of Irish securities since the commencement of this agitation. That decline just means this—that Englishmen who had invested their money in what were thought the best Irish securities are now anxious to get it back again, and that Irishmen too, if they have money to invest, prefer to send it out of the country. See what injury this has done us. We were a poor country; industrial enterprise might have made us rich; but for such enterprise capital and confidence are necessary; and confidence has been annihilated, and capital driven away. Just at this moment there is a glut of capital in England; investors are anxiously inquiring what they can do with their money; but one thing they will not do with it—send it to Ireland. And we must not wonder, for capital is a timid thing. No man likes to send his money where he does not see a reasonable prospect of getting it back again. Now those who have raised the cry of No Landlordism may easily raise the cry of No Creditorism. If a man who gives his land to raise a crop is not entitled to get it back again after the crop has been gathered, why is the man who gives his money to found an industry to be entitled to get it back again after the industry has been founded? An English investor in Irish Consols might fear to be taxed as an absentee, or denounced as a bloodsucker, draining the resources of the country. So I see little probability that the securities of an Irish Government would stand at a higher level in commercial markets than Turkish or Egyptians.

Yet an Irish Government would badly want money from abroad, for financial difficulties would be some of the first they would be troubled with. I will not enquire whether England would insist on Ireland sharing any of the responsibility of the Imperial debt; for I fear the mere working of the ordinary machinery of Government would be felt to be an oppressive burden. One addition to our present expenditure you must certainly calculate on. When Irish independence has been obtained, and American contributions cease to flow in, what is to become of those members of Parliament whom these contributions enable to lead a pleasant existence? They will feel that the labourer is worthy of his hire; and, no doubt, one of the first additions to the National burdens will be a provision for the payment of all members of Parliament.

Still better rewards must be provided for the more deserving. The addition of £1,000 a-year made to the salary of the chief magistrate of our heavily-taxed city is a fair specimen of what may be expected from future legislators. And I have no doubt that measures for the relief of distress would demand the attention of our new Government. We have seen in our own city the growth of distress as agitation has proceeded, as those who used to spend money here now have it no longer to spend, and as employment fails through the paralysis of commercial enterprise. I have no doubt that like distress would prevail in a separated Ireland, and that it would only be increased by nostrums invented to appease a people crying out under suffering, of the cause of which they were ignorant. There would be increased taxation, tempting people who had money to carry it out of the country if they were able. But I suppose the favourite nostrum would be protection of Irish industries. That would mean that any of you crossing to England would have the comfort of having his luggage searched going and returning; it would mean the formation of a new army of tide-waiters and revenue officers; it would mean a heavy indirect taxation of people forced to pay more than the value for a number of articles made under the disadvantage of inferior skill and little capital. As Ireland thus became a disadvantageous country to live in, there would be a constant drain from it of those whom it would be most desirable to keep. I don't say they would all go at once: many would not be able to move without too heavy loss; but when they come to put their sons out into the world, they will not choose them to remain in Ireland.

There are other troubles with which a new Irish Government would have to contend. First, there are the labouring classes. "No landlordism" just means the perpetual serfdom of the labouring classes. It means that no one is to be allowed to have a farm unless he has money enough to buy the land out-and-out. Will the labouring classes be satisfied with that state of things? I think not; and I think their discontent likely to give serious trouble to their governors. And then we all know that a large section of the population will be seriously disaffected to the new Government. What I have heard of the state of feeling in Ulster inspires me with the very gravest apprehensions that the submission of that province cannot be obtained without bloodshed. And why should they be asked to submit? The question is, Are the minority bound to submit to the will of the majority? If so, Mr. Parnell and his followers are in the Empire a very small minority, and it is for them to submit. If not, why should not Ulster have its separate government, as in former days many kings reigned in separate parts of Ireland?

But I hear it asked, Why should not Irishmen be allowed to settle their own affairs? By Irishmen is meant Mr. Parnell and his followers: for I find that anyone who does not agree with them, no matter how long he and his ancestors may have lived in this country, is not recognised as an Irishman, and is only counted one of the English garrison. Well, I do not in the least object to Mr. Parnell and Co. settling their own affairs; but I do object to their settling my affairs—your affairs—our affairs.

But I am asked, Why should not Protestants be willing to trust their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen? And a good friend of mine tells me of the kindness, and forbearance, and generosity with which we should be treated.

But I don't want to be under the necessity of depending on the kindness or generosity of anyone. Such security as we have for our lives and properties at present, we have without having to thank anyone's forbearance, and we wish to keep it. If I went to the Zoological Gardens, the lion's keeper might tell me what a very kind and generous beast the animal was. He might put his head in his mouth, and ask me to admire the lion's great forbearance. But if he invited me to do the same, I should thank him, but tell him I had rather not.

I will give you some reasons showing that our distrust is reasonable. And first, let me ask what an Irish Parliament is wanted for. It must be in order to do something which an English Parliament will not. It is really the small confidence I have in the English Parliament which fills me with immense terror as to the proceedings of an Irish Parliament. I can conceive nothing in reason, or a good deal beyond reason, that Mr. Parnell could not get done by the present Parliament. In the conflict of parties, politicians on both sides think more of what will put themselves and their party in power, than of what will best promote the interests of the Empire; and one who commands eighty-six votes in the House of Commons will not be lightly refused any demand. And English people, in general, know so little, and care so little, about Irish affairs, that a proposal about Ireland may be very flagrantly unjust, and yet excite little English indignation or opposition. You must consider what things an English Parliament is likely to refuse, in order to judge how very outrageous the plans must be which it requires an Irish Parliament to carry into law.

A second cause for alarm is what we see at present of the conduct of those who will have a predominant influence in the election of an Irish Parliament. When the Land Leaguers get the power of making laws, are they likely to give those who differ from them that liberty of speech and action which they take from them at present in defiance of law? A man is liable

to be boycotted if he obeys the law of the land and the laws of honesty, and pays his rent. I know of cases where men who have not the least sympathy with the League have found themselves forced to become members of it on pain of not being able to carry on their business; for a law has been enacted, such as we read of in the Apocalypse, that no man shall be allowed to buy or sell who has not the mark of the beast in his forehead. It may be expected, then, that if they get more power, they will insist that the mark of the beast shall be made fuller and blacker. Here in Dublin, and in Ulster, we Protestants are numerous enough to be able to give each other protection; but what religious liberty is likely to be enjoyed by isolated Protestants in country districts in the south? And even here if we are allowed liberty of thought, I am not so sure that we shall be allowed liberty of speech. I fear we may be allowed to hold our convictions only on condition of not giving utterance to them. Then what protection is there likely to be for the property of Protestant institutions? Trinity College was a Protestant institution, founded by a Protestant sovereign, and with Protestant objects. We now throw our doors open freely to everybody, and men of all religions have equal rights to all our honours and prizes. Yet Archbishop Walsh declared the other day that if he were offered a sum of money for the foundation of a University of his own, the "bribe" ought to be rejected. His new University could not possess our prestige, and if we were suffered to continue to exist, it would be overshadowed by our reputation. The nobleman who bought "Punch" from the showman entertained just as sensible an idea as one who thinks that if he got possession of our University, he would get possession of our prestige, or that its reputation could survive after it had fallen into the hands of obscurantists. But I cannot be secure that this or any other injustice may not be perpetrated by men whose favourite study is what they call Irish History; that is to say, a one-sided and exaggerated account of wrongs suffered by their forefathers, for which, if they were twice as great, we of this generation are not responsible. They seem to take these accounts as a guide to their conduct, and to think that if they do not exact a full measure of retaliation, they will be entitled to claim credit for forbearance and liberality.

I have no doubt that the result of what is called Home Rule would be the driving out much of the wealth and much of the intelligence of the country. Our Church would be the first to feel the loss; for to us the landlords mostly belong, whom indeed it has already been proposed to buy out. The next to feel it would be the Presbyterians and the other Protestant sects. If the support we gave them were removed, they would find it

difficult to sustain the pressure of a dominant majority. The next to suffer would be the cultured and intelligent lay Roman Catholics, who would find the atmosphere of the country stifling, if we were forced to desert it. I have many good friends among them; but I do not know one who is a Home Ruler. And lastly, the Roman Catholic clergy would find, if we departed, what influence our presence has exercised in keeping religion of any kind alive in the land. Some of them were short-sighted enough to triumph when our Church was disestablished and disendowed. Did our depression bring any increase of power to them? Why, I remember how, when a seat in Parliament was vacant, the Roman Catholic bishop and clergy met in committee, and whoever they nominated was the member. Who in Ireland nominates members of Parliament now? They do not lead the present movement, but follow it, joining in it because they would be deserted if they didn't. It is only with reserve that Irishmen now will obey even the Pope. When the Roman Catholic Archbishopric of Dublin was vacant, the Pope wished that Dr. Moran should be appointed; Mr. Parnell wished that it should be Dr. Walsh. You know who was appointed. I am quite sure that under Home Rule the Roman Catholic priests would find that they had less influence than now. Some honours and privileges might be given them at first, by way of offering an affront to Protestant England; but the inevitable course of our revolution would be the same as that of the French Revolution, and if it began by a triumph of Romanism, it would end in a triumph of Infidelity.

In conclusion, I cannot help expressing my surprise that the Liberal party in England have not learned some modesty from the failure of their former predictions. First it was the Disestablishment of our Church which was to give peace and contentment to Ireland. That did not succeed, and it was followed by a Land Act a year or two afterwards. But the predictions of the golden days that were to follow the introduction of religious equality were not realized. The country became more disturbed and more discontented. But the Liberal politicians declared—We must have faith in our remedies. We must not despair of them because they do not produce their effect all at once. Let us administer a stronger dose. Then followed the Land Act of 1881. But what has been the result? The country felt no gratitude to its doctors. Mr. Gladstone had not a single supporter returned at the last election. I think he must be tempted to echo what Archbishop Whately was once provoked to say: "Do you know how they spell 'grateful' in Ireland? 'G, r, e, a, t f, oo, l.'" And the state of the country has become such that there are parts of it where the anarchy can only be

described as a lapse from civilization to barbarism. Yet the doctors who have brought their patient to this ask us to trust their science, and allow them now to apply a remedy the application of which fills all prudent men with horror. I know no theorists, since Dr. Sangrado, so resolved not to let their faith be shaken by the teaching of experience. His remedy, you remember, was bleeding and drinking hot water. When the patient got worse, he ordered more bleeding and more hot water. When he was at the point of death, still more bleeding and more hot water. When he died, the doctor declared it was because he had not been bled enough, or had not enough of hot water.

I have said nothing as to the danger which a Repeal of the Union would cause to the financial interests of our Church, which has three millions invested on the security of Irish land, and which is threatened with a far heavier loss than that of any invested capital—the loss of the people who gave us that capital, and who, if allowed to remain here, and in possession of their properties, might give us as much more. I leave others to speak of that. I content myself with raising my voice as a citizen in protest against the disintegration of the great Empire to which I belong.

The Dean of Clonfert supported the resolution, and said:—Many attempts have been made in recent years to soothe Irish discontent, and on each occasion it was confidently expected that the proposed measure, when passed, would reconcile the Irish race to England. The Disestablishment of the Church was to be, in Mr. Gladstone's phrase, "a message of peace to Ireland." Mr. Bright was confident that it would "sweeten the breath of the Irish people." But such expectations were signally disappointed. Then the first Land Act, then the second, was to remove all remaining source of bitterness; and when these were passed, there was to be harmony between the two countries. They were passed, and the agitation against the English connection became more furious in consequence of these very successes which it had attained. And now it is discovered by the so-called statesmen who manage our affairs, that the supreme remedy is an Irish Parliament—a perilous experiment, which would be quite counter to the movement of the age. For now, all over the world, men are massing together into great political bodies, and it cannot be safe for this United Kingdom to tamper with its own internal union in presence of the great States which confront it everywhere.

But it is said that this concession to Ireland of an independent Legislature will bind the two islands in closer union than ever. It will remove the last cause of difference, and establish friend-

ship, which community of interest will render perpetual. Those who cherish such expectations ignore the capital fact in the relations between the two countries—the deep-seated hatred of England which is in the heart of the Irish race. That hatred, indeed, cannot be quite overlooked. It is proclaimed in the Irish Press, it is avowed in the Imperial Parliament, it is manifested in the Irish-American plots for dynamite outrage. But it is always supposed to be due to some present grievance, and it is expected that when this is removed, the bitter alienation will pass away. Repeated experience might have shown how fallacious is the hope. The hatred of England which is cherished by the Irish race has its roots in the history of the past, and cannot be cured by any legislative charm. It is said, indeed, that every nation in Europe might have bitter memories of conquest and oppression, but that these are suffered to sleep in early mediæval history. True; but the case of Ireland differs. Her bloody memories are comparatively recent. She bears in her bosom the recollection of a protracted agony only lately ended. For centuries England was too much occupied with Continental wars to prosecute with continuous energy the incorporation of Ireland so as to form a great State, which should be powerful and secure. And not till the reign of Elizabeth was this great work undertaken in earnest. But then it coincided with the Reformation. The struggle between Irish and English became a struggle between Roman Catholic and Protestant, and absorbed into itself all the bitterness of those wars of religion which for more than a century rent Europe asunder. It is unnecessary to recount the sad succession of rebellion, confiscation, massacre, war, penal laws, reaching into the very century in which we live. But it is very necessary to remember that these all have generated in the Irish race a hatred of England, which is transmitted from generation to generation as a hereditary passion. The one remedy for this is persistent continuance in patient justice. But if now, while it is still active, it is to have free play in an Irish Parliament, it can end in nothing but permanent alienation between the two islands.

Think of the difference between the Irish and English in tradition, habit, national character, and political sympathies, and say can national welfare result from the establishment of the two Legislatures side by side, on the undulations of political circumstance, like two colliding ironclads, to waste each other with mutual opposition and resistance continually renewed. Or is it supposed that harmony can be established by granting to Ireland restricted powers of separate legislation, the restrictions to form a new grievance, which would be denounced by Irish

orators as English tyranny, until at length they were swept away? With restrictions or without them, any measure of legislative separation could not fail to give scope and play to national hatred, to divergent policy, to mutual jealousy, which would embitter the relations of the two islands, and increase their alienation from each other.

And what would be the effect of all this on that great Empire which we have won by our bravery and our genius, and which we hold in trust for the good of the world? Would not division at home paralyse our power at its source? Would it not open the door in Ireland for foreign intrigue, possibly for the entry of hostile force? While the bitter dissension between England and Ireland would propagate itself throughout the Empire between those who were respectively of English and of Irish origin, and that sentiment of attachment to the mother country which promises to be such a source of strength, would be confused and weakened when the mother country was herself divided. Such division would proclaim to the world that we had lost organic force and power of cohesion, and the nations would feel that the great British Empire had begun to go to pieces.

For ourselves, the loyal minority of Irishmen, as we try to forecast our future, we ask ourselves why is it that the Irish masses and the Irish Roman Catholic clergy cannot be appeased by apparently unlimited concessions? Why is it that nothing will satisfy them but an Irish Parliament? And the only complete answer that we can find is, because they seek objects which they know that none but an Irish Parliament would ever grant—the spoliation, the humiliation, the suppression of those whom it is hoped that England, after having beguiled them with Acts of settlement, with solemn national compacts, with Parliamentary titles to their property, and every specious form in which national honour can be pledged, will in the end abandon and betray.

If such be the course which English statesmen are prepared to take, we prefer the hardship which will be our portion to the dishonour which will be theirs.

The resolution was then put to the meeting and unanimously adopted.

The Right Hon. R. R. Warren.—The previous resolutions have been moved by Bishops, and supported by landed proprietors, and I, as a professional man, who has taken an active part in the temporal affairs of the Church, have been requested to propose the next resolution. I trust that as long as I am able to work, I shall be found at the post of duty in Ireland, working for the Church.

The resolution is this :—

"That, believing, for the reasons already stated, that the policy against which we have protested would be injurious to the best interests—social, moral, and religious—of our country, we consider ourselves further bound to resist it as tending to impoverish, if not to expatriate, many of those on whose support the maintenance of our Church, under God, depends, and thereby to disable her in the efforts which she is making to supply the spiritual needs of her people."

The income of the Church in 1885 was about £420,000—an insufficient income to provide even a modest maintenance for an educated and married clergy: any diminution must cause personal distress and general weakness. How will the Home Rule scheme affect this income? £151,000 represents the interest of mortgages on Irish land. Is this land to be directly confiscated, or indirectly, by entrusting it to the guardianship of an Irish Parliament? £136,000 represents the gifts of residents in Ireland—some four-fifths of it the gifts of landholders. Are these landholders, residents in parishes in all the counties, and supporters of their parish churches, to be impoverished, or actually expatriated, or driven from their homes in country districts, where local ties awaken and call into action sympathies for the Church? And what of the remainder of the Church's income? So far as it is derived from the security of stocks or shares in Ireland, the anticipation of Home Rule has shaken such property to its base. Take the very first of Irish securities—Bank of Ireland Stock—fallen in a year from £300 to £255!

The Prime Minister, as if *inops consilii*, has appealed to all classes, whether concerned with land or industries or property in general, for indications of their views on the great subjects of land, social order, and Irish self-government. This great representative assembly—representing a loyal Church, dependent on land industries and property—this day emphatically indicates its views, that security of landed property or of industrial liberty cannot and will not co-exist with Irish self-government. And what of social order, without which other things more precious than property must perish? Let me cite an authority, and commend it with our approval to the enquirer—a Cabinet Minister—a late Chief Secretary, with only too many opportunities of Irish experiences. He arrived just after the "altercation" in the Park, and had to investigate too many unhappy deaths! Mr. Trevelyan says, as far as law and order and the peace of the country are concerned, there is no half-way-house between entire separation and Imperial control. Well, no Englishman has yet been found so base or so foolish as to suggest entire separation.

We, in this Synod, agree with Mr. Trevelyan, and indicate his

views as ours, that social order cannot and will not co-exist with Irish self-government.

Let Irish self-government be granted, and one or other of two alternatives must follow—civil war or separation; and there are statesmen in the Cabinet who know full well that the result of separation must be the humiliation of the British Empire, and her people, nay, all Europe, America, Asia, will see written upon the wall, in characters that they can read without a prophet's aid —Ichabod.

The High Sheriff of County Louth (Mr. Thomas P. Cairnes).—My Lord, I beg to second the resolution proposed by Judge Warren.

It may probably be objected by some that in the course now adopted, in making her voice heard in the present crisis, and entering her solemn protest against the policy of separation with which we are threatened, the Church of Ireland is departing from the course she has hitherto consistently pursued, of keeping clear of political questions, and is adopting that so openly followed by the Church of Rome, of entering the arena of party politics, and treating the sacred cause of religion as a subject for political strife. Such an objection would come with singularly bad grace from those who themselves notoriously adopt this course. But we need not have recourse to such an *ad hominem* argument to justify our conduct. The question with which we are dealing is not one, in the ordinary sense of the word, "political." It is a question as to the abrogation of a fundamental law—a change in the very framework of the Constitution—a change which we hold would be fraught with imminent peril, not only to our civil but also to our religious liberties; and this being so, it is our undoubted right—nay, it is our bounden duty as Churchmen—to make the voice of the Church heard, calmly and temperately, but at the same time boldly and distinctly, in defence of those liberties. In the previous resolutions several distinct and important grounds were stated, on which we base our objections to the establishment of a separate Legislature in this country, and on the evils we apprehend would flow from it; and in the one now under consideration further reasons are put forward on which we ground our opposition to this proposal, namely, that it is calculated to affect injuriously the best interests, moral, social, and religious, of our native land, and to impoverish, if not expatriate, those on whom the maintenance of our Church mainly depends. If this be so, there can be no doubt we have strong grounds for appealing against it to the patriotism and public spirit of British statesmen.

Let us see how far the opinion we put forward as to the evil

effects of such a measure can be justified. Widely differing, nay, absolutely antagonistic, opinions are held as to the effects of Home Rule. While we, in common with all other Protestant Churches in this country, as well as a large section of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, and that of the best educated and most cultured class, regard it, as stated in the resolution, as being calculated to injure the best interests of our country, on the contrary, those who demand it represent it as the one panacea for all the ills of Ireland. When once it is obtained, poverty and discontent will disappear, and a golden age of peace, plenty, and prosperity is, they assert, immediately to ensue! Now, see which of these very conflicting opinions will bear the test of examination; and I will make that examination by appealing to two tests the fairness of which cannot be impugned; namely, the attitude and action of the statesman who proposes to introduce the measure, and the character and conduct of those who demand it. Now, what is Mr. Gladstone's attitude in introducing this measure, and how does he propose to bring it in? Does he introduce it on any intelligible grounds of equity or justice, as the natural and necessary development of political principles long since recognised and approved? Or, does he not rather bring it forward under the pressure of political necessity forced upon him by the peculiar balance of political parties, and with a view to remove the political deadlock, rather than from any serious conviction that it would benefit this country? Is it not admitted by the most competent politicians that it is a measure never before seriously entertained by any responsible statesman, and only now suddenly sprung upon the political world within the last few months? To question the fitness of the people of this country to be entrusted with complete legislative and executive powers is, of course, a political heresy of the deepest dye. But let us judge of Mr. Gladstone's opinion on this subject by considering the accompaniments with which this measure of Home Rule is to be introduced. It is, we are informed, so "inextricably interwoven with the questions of the land and social order that it is past the wit of man to disentangle them;" and so this great panacea, this salutary and beneficial measure, is not to be introduced alone, but accompanied by two other measures—one for the purpose of securing landlords against absolute and complete spoliation before they are driven out of the country, and the other to afford some protection for such of the loyal minority as may remain, against the tyranny of the triumphant majority. Now, if Home Rule be the simple act of justice it is represented, if its effects would be of that purely salutary and beneficial character that are described, and if the people of Ireland are so fully qualified to be intrusted with legis-

lative and executive power, whence is the necessity for the introduction of these safeguards, the establishment of these elaborate guarantees? Does not all this indicate clearly, that Mr. Gladstone at least has grave doubts as to the fitness of the National party to be intrusted with power, and regards it at best as a doubtful and dangerous experiment, that would expose us to new political dangers calling for extraordinary measures of precaution to guard against them?

And now to glance for a moment at the light which the character and conduct of those who demand Home Rule throw upon its probable effects. What has been the conduct for the last five years of the Nationalist party themselves? Has it not been characterized by such a violent and partisan spirit, such a disregard for the principles of equity and justice, as to demonstrate their unfitness to be intrusted with either legislative or executive powers? and is not this very unfitness, as exhibited in the Imperial House of Commons, one of the most powerful inducements to deal with the present question? And can any reasonable man doubt that if intrusted with such powers, they would continue to exercise them in the same violent and partisan spirit?

And now, one word in conclusion as to the hope we may entertain as to the success of our appeal. That appeal is to the public opinion of Great Britain—to the honour and patriotism of British statesmen; and hampered though they be by the ties of party, and pressed by political exigencies, still I cannot believe that the appeal of the loyal Protestants of this country, of those who have always shown an unswerving attachment to the British connection, will be made to such men in vain. Be that as it may. Let the appeal be made boldly. Let the issue be put clearly and distinctly, and the issue is this—Will they, in deference to the clamour of a troublesome political party, to the pressure of political exigencies, adopt a course alike impolitic and dishonourable, and sacrifice those who have been always true to the interests of the Empire, and hand over the future destinies of this country to an ignorant and misguided people? or will they break themselves free from the trammels of party, assert their true principles, and refuse to give their sanction to any measure which would disturb or impair that legislative Union which affords the only real and adequate guarantee for the continuance of our civil and religious liberties?

The Archdeacon of Derry supported the resolution, which was then passed unanimously.

The Provost of Trinity College.—My Lord, the resolution which I am about to propose is so obvious a corollary from that which we have already done that it will be unnecessary to say a word in support of it. This is the resolution :—

"That copies of the foregoing resolutions be transmitted by the Secretaries of the Synod to Her Majesty the Queen, to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to the Prime Minister, and to the Chief Secretary for Ireland."

Turning to the general question, I may say there are three considerations that admonish me to be brief. First, the late hour; second, that every conceivable subject has been touched upon; and third—and it is a thing I am happy to bear witness to—that on this occasion the Church of Ireland has spoken with no uncertain sound. This is not the first time I have had the honour of addressing this assembly, and I have generally to persuade, or try to persuade, some of the members who do not agree with me. On the present occasion I have no such duty, and, perhaps, as a speaker, I might say no such privilege. I feel sure there is not one man in this crowded Hall who differs from his brethren on this important occasion. What remains for me but to gather up a few of the crumbs that have fallen from the tables, or hands, or jaws of the orators who have preceded me, and try to make something out of them? One important question was stated in the very beginning. It was said, "It will be objected to you that you are trenching on politics, which are no affair of yours." It reminds me very much of the story that was found in scientific or semi-scientific history, of a certain philosopher who was on one occasion engaged in investigating a problem in the quiet of his own study, when suddenly a maid-servant ran in and exclaimed, "Sir, the house is on fire." "Go to my wife, you fool," said the philosopher; "do I ever concern myself with household matters?" Well, I do not say our house is on fire, but fire is very near, and if we do as the philosopher did on that occasion, we shall be laughed at as we have laughed at the philosopher. But worse than that. Surely we have to reckon with the men who have chosen us to defend their interests, to watch when danger is threatening the Church or the country, and to do their best to avert the danger. Would they be satisfied if, when danger was coming, we took no means to avert it? Would they be satisfied with the trite apophthegm that we have no concern in politics? The answer that would be given by our constituents one and all, would be, "You have betrayed your trust, and you have been false to your duty."

Perhaps I may be excused for inquiring, somewhat as a natural philosopher might inquire, if we had Home Rule, what would be

the result? I am not now going to ask what are the motives of those engaged in the promotion of the idea of Home Rule—whether they may be good, bad, or indifferent,—except so far as those people reveal their motives themselves. Suppose a man put a red-hot poker into a barrel of gunpowder in our immediate vicinity. We do not want to know what his motives were, or whether he was a kind, or generous, or good individual. We only want to know that, given a red-hot poker in contact with a barrel of gunpowder, we should have an explosion. Now, in the first place, what is Home Rule, as it is demanded, or as it is supposed to settle the question? What power is demanded for it? The power of legislating upon all Irish affairs. Well, what affairs are there that concern this country that would not be considered Irish affairs? The power of taxation is a thing that must go to an Irish Parliament. Even if we had a right, and were bound, to contribute a certain amount to Imperial taxation, the incidence of taxation must go to an Irish Parliament if it was here. That is to say, the Irish Parliament might at any moment repeal the duty on whiskey, and put the duty on land instead. The incidence of taxation is, therefore, one power that must be given to an Irish Parliament. Another is the command of the police, and the third is the making of laws which concern the property of the country—the making of laws like the Land Act of 1881.

If they give to Ireland a separate Parliament, they cannot deny it powers like these. In short, they should give it as large powers in Ireland as the British Parliament possesses in England. For all the affairs that concerned Ireland it would be omnipotent. Well, how would it use that power? It is all very well to talk of "generous confidence" and "trust your fellow-countrymen," and all that kind of thing; but with all respect, still recurring to the spirit of philosophy, I prefer to judge by what they have done. Who are the people that we have to trust? Who are the people that would be the constituents of this new Parliament? They would be the peasantry and the tenant farmers of Ireland. What use have they made of the powers they have already? What use does the National League make of its power, which is one of the greatest powers that have ever been in this country? Do they use it in any way consistent with civil liberty? No, they do not; and the practice of boycotting, which, as we know, is rife through the country, is directed not at all so much for political advantage as for the curtailment of civil liberty. I will mention one case of the boycotting of schools, out of many that come under my notice as a Commissioner of National Education. A school was boycotted, and the children were removed—even though the master of the school was a Roman Catholic, and a most excellent and exemplary man—for no other fault but that

the master's father and mother were the caretakers of a hunt club house. In another case, that of a girls' school, it was boycotted because the husband of the mistress of the school voted against the National candidate for the Poor-law guardianship, and the children were all taken away. One of the most common things is that when a man who has children at a school makes himself unpopular, the schoolmaster is warned to send that man's children away, or else all the children will be withdrawn. That is quite a common thing. Now, that is the way in which the constituents in the new Parliament would treat the principle of civil liberty.

We are told about guarantees; but who is to give them? Let us suppose they are given by the heads of the Irish Parliament, commencing with Mr. Parnell, and I have no objection to suppose the men perfectly honest in giving those guarantees. But how could they give them? Suppose that, when they came back, they tried to persuade the Irish Parliament to keep those guarantees, the House might reply, "We never promised them, and you must stand aside, and we will do what we like." It is the experience of history that guarantees of that kind are worth nothing, because there is no man who could give them in such a way as to bind others. Some people say that attack is always stronger than defence—that Home Rule is inevitable, and that we had better make the best of the bargain. But that is like a rhetorical artifice we have heard over and over again. When a man cannot prove a thing, he says—"It is perfectly certain—don't ask me to argue the question; but it cannot be doubted for a moment." And just in the same way with Home Rule; the man who cannot prove it says it is pretty certain that the thing must come.

But there is a story in Ireland's history that is not unknown to my friend the Bishop of Derry. To the people there that doctrine was preached. They, too, were told—the obscure youths of that city were told—"It is useless to make a defence—make the best bargain you can; the capture of your city is inevitable, and little else remains for you but to try to do the best for yourselves." The citizens and the city scorned that advice, and the name of Derry has proved for all history and for all time that all is not lost that is in danger, and that there was once a day when the defence proved too strong for the attack. There never was a time when darkness shrouded that which is to come more closely from our eyes than now. God alone has the disposition of that which is to happen. It remains but for us to do our duty—to do it, I will say, as Irishmen—to do it as citizens of this great Empire—to do it having regard to the men who sent us here, and who are now watching anxiously and hopefully, and tomorrow joyfully for our action.

Mr. James Spaight.—Having just received your Grace's request to second this resolution, I consent willingly, as I consider it the duty of everyone in the present crisis to do all that in him lies to promote the objects of this meeting. I came here to listen, not to speak, and never have I experienced more intense pleasure and delight than in listening to the whole debate, including the magnificent address of the Lord Bishop of Derry, and the unanswerable logic of Dr. Salmon's speech, so full of common sense and genuine Irish humour. Our chief purpose is not so much to reach the ear of the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary, as to teach the public opinion of Great Britain. I do not believe the great heart of England can remain unmoved on hearing the eloquent and weighty words spoken in the Synod this day, where every division has been removed, and where all sections, Whig and Tory, Conservative and Liberal, have been fused by the heat of this burning question into one compact and solid mass of loyalty.

I was delighted to hear from the Bishop of Down that Ulster Protestants will not desert their brethren in the south. That assurance will give hope and comfort to many humble Protestants in the south and west, whose position, deserted by their friends, and surrounded by enemies, would otherwise be sad indeed! It will sustain them to know that if the worst comes to the worst, they will, among Ulster Protestants, find a refuge and a home.

The Earl of Belmore.—In seconding this resolution, my Lord, I would move as a rider—

"And that the Standing Committee be instructed to embody the resolutions in Petitions from the General Synod, to be presented to both Houses of Parliament."

After all, it is not what Mr. Gladstone may wish or decide, but what the Houses of Parliament may decide, that will settle the question of Home Rule. I believe I have heard some one say that the granting of Home Rule is inevitable; but after a Parliamentary experience of nearly thirty years, I have come to a different conclusion. To my mind such a contingency is extremely improbable, and I think things point the other way. With reference to the question of land purchase, I have always been in favour of such a scheme; but I think the British taxpayer has become thoroughly alarmed at the magnitude of what is supposed to be the present proposal. It will not be possible, however, I think, to carry Home Rule in any case, and certainly not without being accompanied by some such measure as Mr. Gladstone may have in view, dealing perhaps only with the encumbered or more heavily taxed estates.

Judge Darley also supported the resolution, which was then unanimously passed, with the addition proposed by Lord Belmore.

The Lord Bishop of Kilmore.—My Lord Archbishop, I rise to propose a resolution which, though not on the paper, will, I feel sure, meet with the full approval of this Synod. It is as follows:—

"That the proceedings of this day, including the Address of His Grace the President, the resolutions, and the speeches reported in full, be printed in pamphlet form, and circulated in the United Kingdom as widely as to the Standing Committee of the General Synod may seem advisable, and that the Standing Committee be instructed to embody the resolutions in petitions from the General Synod to be presented to both Houses of Parliament."

We must all feel thankful for the success of this day's proceedings. The Prime Minister asked for the opinions of all classes with regard to those Irish questions which are agitating the public mind at present. We send our reply in the resolutions unanimously passed this day, and in the able speeches delivered in support of them.

The Church of Ireland, represented so fully in Synod, has spoken with no uncertain sound as regards the proposed ruinous policy of Home Rule. It is a matter of the greatest importance that the able speeches to which we have listened this day should be preserved in a permanent form and circulated as widely as possible through England and Scotland, where the public mind requires so much enlightenment on the subject.

The letter which I hold in my hand is from a distinguished minister of the Presbyterian Church, and shows how fully alive the members of that Church are as to the great importance of widely circulating their opinions on the subject of Home Rule. This letter states that the Presbyterian body in Ulster have transmitted copies of the resolutions passed by them against Home Rule, or separation, to every minister of their communion in Scotland and England, with a request that he may take occasion to bring the subject before his congregation. I am strongly of opinion that a similar course ought to be adopted by this Synod with regard to the bishops and clergy of the Church of England, and of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

Without further trespassing on the time of this Synod, I beg to propose the resolution.

The Lord Bishop of Killaloe.—In deference to your Grace's wish just conveyed to me, that each bishop present should so far identify himself with the work to-day as to move or second some resolution, I rise to support that which has been moved by the Bishop of Kilmore. It would require an inventive genius, greater than I could pretend to, to find now any new phase of the subject that has engaged our attention, to pre-

sent to this Synod; and it would be an unwarrantable act, at so late an hour and at this stage of our proceedings, to attempt anything of a speech. I for one felt deeply thankful that the General Synod of the Church of Ireland was thus specially summoned, and it is most gratifying and encouraging to see one of, I think, the largest assemblages we have ever had, at least in these later days. One thing I would wish to say, that we ought not to adopt a desponding tone, nor look upon our surrounding circumstances, dark and ominous as they are, with anything of a despairing view. Such a spirit or such an attitude is most injurious, and would go far to paralyse the efforts that each and all of us should put forth to the utmost of our power. Nor have we, I maintain, any reason for despondency. We have been brought through troubles and difficulties ere now. I may be over-sanguine; yet some way I think that it is at least possible—even more, I think probable—that Mr. Gladstone will not be able to carry out the purposes it is alleged he has in view. The Church of Ireland has to-day, in this her great representative assembly, spoken in no hesitating or uncertain tone; and, while we may be thankful for this, let us still remember that there is above and over all the Church of Ireland's glorious Head, who rules and orders the concerns of His people here according to the counsel of His own will. If the worst should happen, if the darkest disaster that we could apprehend should befall us, it will be, not because England's Sovereign assented—not because England's Prime Minister, her statesmen, or Houses of Parliament carried through the destructive measures, but because He that is "higher than the highest" permitted it in the furtherance of His own omnipotent purposes—purposes that, though often dark and perplexing to us, are always wise and always beneficent. Still, as I have said, we ought not to anticipate those darker and more trying issues; fully admitting that there is much naturally calculated to disturb and alarm, we need to bear in mind that one method of His acting who controls all connected with us is to let things come often to the extremest point of peril, and then, by one touch, to bring, like lightning from the depth of the thunder-cloud, the unexpected help and change, giving force to the old familiar proverbs—"When things come to the worst, they'll mend," or, "Man's extremity is God's opportunity." And not this alone, but many a record, alike in history sacred and secular, goes to show that He allows men to carry out their own machinations while He seems to stand aloof—to accomplish their own ends with apparently unhindered success—and then He steps in, not only frustrating the dark designs, but using their very efforts for Himself—taking up the threads of their workmanship, and weaving all into the great

final purpose that He from the outset had in view, "making the wrath of man to praise Him, while the remainder of wrath He restrains." We may, then, calmly trust Him for our future, while with unabated energy we use all the appliances within our reach to ward off, if it may be, the evil that we dread: and one result, I trust, will follow from all that has taken place here to-day—the allaying of anxiety and apprehension, and the lookin with a bright and hopeful spirit upon the unknown and clouded prospect that just now confronts our Church and nation.

The resolution was passed.

The Benediction was pronounced, and the Synod adjourned.

Charles W. Gibbs, Printer to the General Synod, 18 Wicklow-street, Dublin.